THE

POST-CAITANYA SAHAJIĀ CULT OF BENGAL

BY

MANINDRA MOHAN BOSE, M.A.

Lecturer in Indian Vernaculars, Ramtanu Lahiri Research Assistant and Keeper of Bengali Manuscripts in the University of Calcutta

PUBLISHED BY THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA
1930

INTRODUCTION

1. Sahajiyā, a Doctrine of Love

Human society, as it is now constituted, can be brought to a state of ideal perfection when there grows in every mind a conception that we all belong primarily to the human race, and that the doctrine we are destined to follow is principally what is the natural religion of man based on an ideal of universal brotherhood. To hold others dear as our own self requires such an adjustment of individuality with relation to other objects of nature that all the heterogeneous elements may appear linked together within the compass of a homogeneous whole. This cannot be effected by philosophical and metaphysical speculations, or by intellectual beliefs in abstract truths, but through the personal realisation of love which is the cement of union. What we now require is a doctrine which should be entirely based on the ideal of love and devoted to the culture of this noble sentiment, so that we can perfectly realise that love is our divine heritage which has imprinted on man the character of a true human being, and that properly cultivated it grows beyond limitations, embracing the whole world with all the ardour of a devoted lover. For the growth of our spiritual insight of this nature modern thinkers have set their hands to the formulation of doctrines like Positivism and Humanism as perfect religions for the future. The illustration of what the

Sahajiyās of Bengal, in their humble way, can contribute to the furtherance of the same ideal may be found in the present treatise.

The term *Sahaja* is a Sanskrit word which etymologically means what one is born with, and thus it refers to the natural tendency which one possesses from birth. In the conception of Divine nature the quality to which the Sahajiyās have given prominence is the attribute of love, maintaining that love is a natural characteristic of the Supreme Being which is possessed by man by virtue of his origin from the Eternal Spirit. They do not rest satisfied by preaching the sermon that God is love, but insist on realising that man also is love. Love in the individual has thus become the first item in their calculation, and they have set up a doctrine aiming at the culture of this quality in man, going up from the concrete to the abstract ideas, from the individual to the Infinite, in their progressive ascent through the atmosphere of spirituality. This spirit of the doctrine has naturally placed it in a position perfectly favourable to the cultivation of the sentiment of universal brotherhood which the modern mind is insisting on for acceptance as a dogma in religion.

The idea of God has come to us through our imagination, and we have invested Him with all the glorious attributes we can conceive of. We generally utilise this conception of God to minister to our needs, but the Sahajiyā doctrine does not contemplate any such necessity. It has made man, and not God, the object of worship, holding fast to the view that the development of human qualities can imprint on man the character of the Supreme Being. It maintains that even salvation cannot come from any outside agency, but it has to be acquired by man by his own perfection. Working

on this ideal, the Sahajiyās have centred all attention on the culture of self, with the conviction that man in potentiality is even superior to gods. In their treatment of the doctrinal points also they have always evinced a tendency to combine philosophy and religion together, with a thorough insight into the reality of our existence. In the sphere of practical culture with Parakīyā companions as well as in the spiritistic conception of the never-ending play of Matter and Energy symbolised in Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, they have proceeded on the same principle by making deductions from the rationalistic observations of nature. This is the true character of the Sahajiyā doctrine which we have tried to illustrate in the pages of this book.

2. Scope of the Work.

The Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā cult of Bengal has been the subject of my research since my appointment as a Ramtanu Lahiri Research Assistant in the University of Calcutta in 1921. The Sahajiyā doctrine is advocated by a good number of people of different shades of opinion and culture all over Bengal, and it possesses a vast literature mostly in manuscript form hitherto almost unknown to the outside public. I have come across a considerable number of Sahajiyā works collected in the library of the Calcutta University, and this has given me the opportunity of gathering correct information from reliable records left by the followers of the cult. I have had the good fortune of becoming intimate with some of the Sahajiyā *gurus* who have always evinced keen interest in my work, and helped me with their valuable suggestions. I have attempted to turn to best account all these sources of information and

materials, and contributed my first study on the subject under the heading of "An Introduction to the Study of the Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā Cult" to the University Journal of the Department of Letters (Vol. XVI, pp. 1-162) in 1927, in which only my preliminary observations on the doctrine were brought to the notice of the public. The present volume contains the fruits of my researches extending over a period of nine years, and I have tried to make it as illuminating as possible by dealing with the subject in details based on the testimony of recognised authorities. It may be stated in this connection that I have sought to be exact and accurate in my treatment of the subject, in consequence of which I had to content myself at places with simple translation of texts quoted in the footnotes. As each topic in this volume has been provided with an elaborate summary for the convenience of readers, I would confine myself at this stage to a simple statement of the general plan of the work with a brief reference to the subjects treated in the five chapters of the book.

Chapter I.—The Sahajiyās are the followers of the Rāgānugā ideal of divine love, and so they do not attach much importance to Vaidhī or formal worship except so far as it is conducive to the growth of Rāgānugā love in the primary stage of spiritual culture. In their treatment of Vaidhī, therefore, they have shown little originality, for they have simply followed the Vaiṣṇava ideal with slight modifications here and there in order to mark it with the stamp of their own doctrine. This is indicated in Chapter I in as brief a compass as possible, for it has very little bearing on the real Sahajiyā culture.

Chapter II.—The Sahajiyā doctrine is wholly based on the ideal of Parakīyā. Parakīyā, however, is denounced in society, but in religion it has been adopted

as a symbol of intense love. The Sahajiyās take Parakīyā companions for the culture of love by lovers, but they denounce, in the strongest terms possible, conscious sensuality of any kind. The reasons they advance for taking female partners, and the preference they give to the Parakīyās, have been fully discussed in this chapter. Parakīyā is of two kinds—(*i*) Bāhya, and (*ii*) Marma, both of which have special utility at different stages of spiritual growth. In the sphere of Marma culture the term Parakīyā has lost its primary significance, being used to denote Niṣkāma Dharma or the doctrine of selfless action, while Svakīyā means works of selfish motive. The former sometimes aims at the realisation of Paramātmā, otherwise called *Para*, but when it enters into the domain of pure love (called Śuddha Parakīyā) it seeks to embrace God with all the ardour of a devoted woman, as was manifested in Rādhā and in Caitanya.

Chapter III. deals with the history of the Sahajiyā doctrine from the earliest time down to the post-Caitanya period. The traces of the ideal of Parakīyā can be found in the Vedas and the Upaniṣads, in some of the ancient Buddhistic literature, in the primitive stage of human society, as well as in the writings of Plato, who while dealing mainly with the intellectual aspect of love, has preached the philosophy of practical culture in the company of woman. This chapter is then devoted to a comparative study of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine with Tāntrikism, with the Buddhist Sahajiyā, and with Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā of the pre-Caitanya period. In the end there is an elaborate discussion pointing out how the modern Sahajiyā doctrine has evolved from the post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism of Bengal.[1]

[1] I have not dealt with the Mahomedan Sufi cult which though a mystic doctrine is founded on entirely different ideals. "It is characterised by intense

Chapter IV is by far the most important chapter of the whole book so far as the higher aspect of the Sahajiyā doctrine is concerned. It is here that the reader is introduced to the true spirit of the cult. The relation between Paramātmā and the individual soul has been fully discussed by pointing out how by the culture of self one can attain to the perfection of God. But the Sahajiyās rise above all limitations when they find in Eternal Matter and Energy the symbol of the union of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. This chapter ends with a comparative study of the Sahajiyā doctrine with Positivism and Humanism of modern Europe.

Chapter V deals with Sahajiyā literature, with the chronology and identification of authors, supplemented by a long list of Sahajiyā books that are in the library of the University of Calcutta.

3. Sahajiyā Sects.

The Sahajiyās are divided into various sects, each following a particular mode of culture narrated in this book. Āul, Bāul, Śāi, Darveśa and Kartābhajā are usually believed to be Sahajiyā sects, but they are not acknowledged as such by the Sahajiyās. They are members of allied cults with separate organisations and institutions of their own.

4. Acknowledgment.

I am indebted to Mr. Haridas Palit who has materially helped me with his advice and suggestions, and to

religious exaltation, an overwhelming consciousness of human frailty, boundless fear of God, and utter submission to His will." (Encyclop. of Religion and Ethics, Vol. 12, p. 11). These are ideas which are quite antagonistic to the spirit of the Sahajiyā faith.

Prof. Amulyacharan Vidyābhuṣan whom I never found wanting in information for the solution of intricate problems. Prof. Sunitikumar Chatterjee, Dr. Prabodhchandra Bagchi, and Mr. Priyaranjan Sen have each gone through a chapter of the manuscript of this book before it was sent to the press. I am highly grateful to them for this kindness, and particularly to Prof. Chatterjee who is instrumental in the publication of this book. Some of my students, friends and my assistant of the manuscript library have prepared the Index, and made many fair copies for the Press. I thank them for their work. Mr. Atulchandra Ghatak, M.A., Superintendent of the Calcutta University Press, has always taken a keen interest in the publication of this book offering many suggestions for improvements, for which I am really grateful to him. It is needless to say that my obligations are boundless to Dr. Dineschandra Sen, Ramtanu Lahiri Research Fellow of the Calcutta University, for his guidance in my research work, and to Mr. Basanta Ranjan Ray, a Lecturer in the department of Indian Vernaculars, who has always been to me a source of inspiration.

MANINDRA MOHAN BOSE.

To

Eternal Matter and Energy

Symbolised

in

Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā.

CONTENTS

Chapter I

Chapter II

Chapter III

Chapter IV

CHAPTER V.

The Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā Cult of Bengal

CHAPTER I

Vaidhī and Rāgānugā

Definitions.

Bhakti is of two kinds: (*i*) Vaidhī, and (*ii*) Rāgānugā.[1] The word Vaidhī has come from Vidhi, which, in the sphere of religion, means the rules of conduct prescribed by the Śāstras (religious books) for the guidance of the devotees. Vaidhī Bhakti is, therefore, that aspect of devotion wherein spiritual advancement is based upon the observance of Śāstric rules.[2] Here Śāstra is in the position of a dictator whose rulings, meant for common good, constitute the law of the domain of religion. But as

[1] এইত সাধন ভক্তি দুইত প্রকার।
এক বৈধীভক্তি, রাগানুগাভক্তি আর॥

Cait. Carit., Canto II, Chap. 22.

বৈধী রাগানুগা চেতি সা দ্বিধা সাধনাভিধা।

Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, 1-2-4.

[2] রাগহীন জন ভজে শাস্ত্রের আজ্ঞায়।
বৈধী ভক্তি বলি তারে সর্ব্ব শাস্ত্রে গায়॥

Cait. Carit., 2-22.

যত্র রাগানবাপ্তত্বাৎ প্রবৃত্তিরুপজায়তে।
শাসনেনৈব শাস্ত্রস্য সা বৈধী ভক্তিরুচ্যতে॥

Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, 1-2-5.

religion is individual, its principal aim is to help the growth in every soul of the germ of spirituality. Freedom in the matter of choice and action is undoubtedly as necessary in religion as in the affairs of state. But in the sphere of Vaidhī culture, the man cannot go beyond certain limits prescribed by the Śāstras, for he has to select one mode or the other approved by these religious codes. If, however, none is found suited to his taste, he cannot venture out of the circumscribed area for fear of denunciation. In an atmosphere like this, the culture of human mind, which is the primary object of religion, cannot find a free scope.

Rāgānugā, on the other hand, literally means 'the pursuit of love,' hence the Bhakti that is designated by this term represents that aspect of devotion which is entirely based upon the finer sentiment of love.[1] Now, love knows no reasoning, admits of no limitation, and is purely a personal concern which follows nothing else than the impulse of the mind. In the way of love, therefore, there is sufficient scope for individual freedom which, if utilised for religious purpose, may effect marvellous improvement upon the spiritual consciousness of man. Consequently, Rāgānugā is perfectly suitable

[1] ইষ্টে স্বারসিকী রাগঃ—পরমাবিষ্টতা ভবেৎ।
তন্ময়ী যা ভবেদ্ভক্তিঃ সাত্র রাগাত্মিকোদিতা॥

Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, 1-2-131.

Also *ibid*, 1-2-148.

ইষ্টে গাঢ়তৃষ্ণা রাগ—এই স্বরূপ লক্ষণ।
ইষ্টে আবিষ্টতা—এই তটস্থ লক্ষণ॥
রাগময়ী ভক্তির হয় "রাগাত্মিকা" নাম।
and শাস্ত্রযুক্তি নাহি মানে—রাগানুগার প্রকৃতি॥

Çait. Carit., Canto II, Chap. 22.

for the culture of human mind. The Vaidhī is like a stream that flows through its accustomed course, whereas Rāgānugā is like the impetuous flood which admits of no bounds, but rushes over banks and barriers, carrying everything before it, by virtue of its own force.[1]

It is said that Rāgānugā or the devotion of love was specially manifested in the atmosphere of Vraja, the place where Kṛṣṇa passed his childhood.[2] The characteristic feature of the early life of Kṛṣṇa, when he was at this place, was the enjoyment of love in its various aspects. He was dearly loved by his parents, held in intimate friendship by his companions, and offered the intoxicating nectar of emotional felicities by the youthful girls of Vraja. This life was, in short, full of love, full of enjoyment, and charmingly beautiful in every respect. This is called the characteristic feature of Vraja, which is fully Rāgānugā in complexion. On this interpretation of the life of Kṛṣṇa is laid the foundation of the Post-Caitanya Bhakti cult of Bengal, about which we shall have occasion to go into details later on.

Rāgānugā is considered better than the Vaidhī.

"The whole world is following the Vaidhī mode of worship, but real love cannot be grown in the mind by adopting that form of spiritual culture" is the authoritative assertion of the writer of the Caitanya Caritāmṛta.[3] In fact, we find that Vidhi is the principal feature of all the religions of the world. We have definite rules for baptism or initiation, for the observance of daily or

[1] Caitanya Chandrodaya, Act I.

[2] রাগাত্মিকা ভক্তি মুখ্যা ব্রজবাসিজনে। *Ibid.*

[3] সকল জগত মোরে করে বিধি ভক্তি।
বিধি ভক্ত্যে ব্রজ ভাব পাইতে নাহি শক্তি ॥
Canto I, Chap. 3.

congregational and weekly worship, for holding yearly festivities, and there are innumerable moral codes in support of austerities, liberalities, renunciations, etc. In short, there is nothing but formalities through which a man must pass from the moment of his birth till he rests in eternal peace in the grave. But this tendency to emphasise formalities is held in low esteem in the higher sphere of spiritual culture. The Premānanda Laharī says,—"Give up the Vaidhī culture, and follow Rāgānugā, for God cannot be realised without love." And why? Because, "by following the Vaidhī mode one can earn merits, by virtue of which one is led to the enjoyment of pleasures in after-life; but that is somewhat like the golden chain worn round the neck. By merits one goes to heaven, but comes back to earth when that merit is exhausted, and thus experiences repeated births and deaths. The Vaidhī mode is simply the first step towards spiritual advancement."[1] But in the higher sphere of all-absorbing divine love there is no room for the Vaidhī practices.[2] Herein the human

[1] বিধি পথ পরিত্যজ রাগানুগা হয়ে ভজ
রাগ বৈলে মিলে না সে ধন।
বৈধী কর্ম্ম যারা করে পুন্যচয় সদা করে
পুন্যে হয় সুখের উদয়॥
সে সুখ অতি তুচ্ছ হয় কোনই কাজের নয়
সোনার শৃঙ্খল যেন হয়॥
সে যুগল রূপ ভাই পুন্যে নাহি মিলে
প্রথম সোপান তাহা জানে ভক্ত কুলে॥
কেবল করেন যিনি পুন্য আচরণ।
স্বর্গ মর্ত্ত্যে পুনঃ পুনঃ করয়ে গমন॥ p. 6.

[2] অকৈতব কৃষ্ণ প্রেম কৈতব না হয়।
বেদাচার বেদনিষ্ঠা ইহা করে ক্ষয়॥
Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 1.

mind communes direct with God, and refuses to be bound down by the fetters of the external world.[1] It is for this reason that the Vaidhī is called Gauṇa, whereas Rāgānugā is termed Mukhya, or the best form of devotion.[2]

Particulars of the Vaidhī culture.

In works like the Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, and the Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Canto II, Chaps. 22 and 23) there are elaborate discussions about the details of these two forms of culture, and Sahajiyā works like the Rāgaratnāvalī, Rasasāra, Sahaja-Tattva, etc., have mostly copied from them. As the works of the Gosvāmīs are too well-known to require elucidation in this place, we shall here principally quote from the Sahajiyā authors and show how they have adopted the ideas from the earlier Vaiṣṇava writers. The Vaidhī Bhakti is of 64 kinds, such as services to the Guru, initiation, visiting the sacred places, chanting of God's names, company of the saints, meditation, etc.[3] By adopting one or more of these services

[1] তুমি আর আমি মাঝে কিছু নাই
কোন বাধা নাই ভুবনে।

Dr. Tagore's song.

[2] মুখ্য আর গৌণ, দুই বিধ ভক্তি হয়।
গৌণ বেদমাতা, মুখ্য বেদাতীত হয়॥

Rasasāra, p. 3.

[3] ভকতি প্রধান করি চৌষট্টি মানি।

Rāgaratnāvalī, p. 7.

চতুঃষষ্টি ভজনাঙ্গ শুনিতে লাগিনু।

Rasasāra, p. 37.

চতুঃষষ্টি অঙ্গ এই পরম মহত্ত্ব।

Cait., Carit., 2-22.

প্রথমেতে শ্রীগুরুর চরণ আশ্রয়।
দ্বিতীয়েতে কৃষ্ণদীক্ষা—এই দুই কয়॥

one can enter into the sphere of divine love,[1] but five among them, such as company of the saints, singing of God's name, listening to sacred texts recited, residence at Mathurā, and worship of the image of God, are considered to be the best of all.[2] By faithfully adopting these spiritual exercises, one can get into the most perfect stage of love. From hearing and singing in the company of the saintly, a man can get the better of his evil tendencies. This will gradually lead to Niṣṭhā, Ruci,

তৃতীয়েতে গুরু সেবা পরম কৌশলে।
সাধু মার্গ অনুসার চতুর্থেতে বলে॥

and

গুরু পদাশ্রয় দীক্ষা গুরুর সেবন।
সদ্ধর্ম্ম শিক্ষা পৃচ্ছা সাধু মার্গানুগমন॥
কৃষ্ণ প্রীতে ভোগত্যাগ কৃষ্ণতীর্থে বাস।
যাবৎ নির্ব্বাহ প্রতিগ্রহ একাদশ্যুপবাস॥ etc.

Cait., Carit., 2-22.

1 একাঙ্গে করিলে নিষ্ঠা প্রেম প্রাপ্তি হয়॥
শ্রীকৃষ্ণ ভজন অঙ্গ না পারে সকল।
শক্তি অনুযায়ী ভজ যার ভক্তি বল॥

Rasasāra, p. 40.

এক অঙ্গ সাধে কেহো সাধে বহু অঙ্গ।
নিষ্ঠা হৈলে উপজয়ে প্রেমের তরঙ্গ॥
এক অঙ্গে সিদ্ধি পাইল বহু ভক্তগণ।

Cait. Carit., 2-22.

2 তার পর পঞ্চবিধা রাগ পথে সাধি।

Rāgaratnāvalī, p. 7.

সাধু সঙ্গ নামকীর্ত্তন ভাগবত শ্রবণ।
মথুরাবাস শ্রীমূর্ত্তি শ্রদ্ধায় সেবন॥
সকল সাধন শ্রেষ্ঠ এই পঞ্চ অঙ্গ।

Cait. Carit., 2-22.

Also Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, 1-2-43.

Āsakti and Prīti, which, when condensed, is called Prema or love.[1] From the Vaidhī culture one can, therefore, go to the highest spiritual perfection. So the Vaidhī cannot be wholly denounced as consisting of unnecessary practices, only it holds an inferior position when compared with Rāgānugā.

Various stages of spiritual life.

The Sahajiyās have also adopted the Vaiṣṇava conception of the various stages of spiritual life with slight modifications. The spiritual life of a man is divided into three stages, namely, Pravarta, or the first stage, Sādhaka or the middle stage, and Siddha or the final stage of perfection. The Pravarta stage is sometimes called the Taṭastha stage, which is further subdivided into four finer sections. In the first quarter of this stage, there is a growth of reverence in the mind, in the second quarter one enjoys the company of the pious men, in the third quarter one practises various modes of culture,

অনর্থ নিবৃত্তি হৈলে ভক্তি নিষ্ঠা হয়।
নিষ্ঠা হৈলে শ্রবণাদ্যে রুচি উপজয়॥
সিদ্ধে গতি হৈতে রুচি জন্ময়ে যখন।
আসক্তি আশ্রয় রুচি জানিহ কারণ॥
আসক্তি প্রগাঢ় হৈলে ভাবসিদ্ধ হয়।
উত্তম সাধক সেই প্রেমের আলয়॥

Rasasāra, pp. 4-5.

সাধুসঙ্গ হৈতে হয় শ্রবণ কীর্ত্তন।
সাধন ভক্ত্যে হয় সর্ব্বানর্থ নিবর্ত্তন॥
অনর্থ বিবৃত্তি হৈতে ভক্তিনিষ্ঠা হয়।
নিষ্ঠা হৈতে শ্রবণাদ্যে রুচি উপজয়॥

Cait. Carit., 2-22.

Also Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, 1-4-11.

and in the fourth, he assumes the true character of a Sādhaka.[1]

There is also difference in the manner of worship adopted in the three stages. A man in the Pravarta stage should recite the names of Hari, in the Sādhaka stage he should recount a formula consisting of five words, and in the Siddha stage he should take to Kāmavīja.[2]

From the Pravarta stage a worshipper can realise Caitanya, from the Sādhaka stage, Rādhā, and from the Siddha stage, Kṛṣṇa.[3]

[1] প্রবর্ত্ত, সাধক, সিদ্ধ, ত্রিগুণ ত্রিগুণ।
ক্রিয়া শুদ্ধি, মন শুদ্ধি, শুনহ লক্ষণ ॥
প্রথম তটস্থ দেহে শ্রদ্ধার উৎপত্তি।
দ্বিতীয় তটস্থে হয় সাধুর সংহতি ॥
তৃতীয় তটস্থে জানে ভজন আশ্রয়।
উত্তম তটস্থে এই সাধক ভাবয় ॥

Rasasāra, p. 4.

[2] প্রবর্ত্ত জনের হরিনাম উপাসনা।
পঞ্চ নাম সার সাধকের উপাসনা ॥
সিদ্ধের যে উপাসনা কামবীজ হয়।

Rāgamayīkaṇā, p. 21.

Also compare—

বৃন্দাবনে অপ্রাকৃত নবীন মদন।
কামগায়ত্রী কামবীজে যাঁর উপাসন ॥

Cait. Carit., 2-8.

N. B.—The Kāmavīja is ক্লীং, and the mystic formula called Kāma-Gāyatrī is ক্লীং কৃষ্ণায় গোবিন্দায় গোপীজনবল্লভায় স্বাহা।

Full particulars may be had in the Gopālatāpanī, vv. 13-14.

[3] হরিনাম উপাসকে প্রভু গৌরচন্দ্র।
প্রাপ্তি পঞ্চনামে রাধাচরণারবিন্দ ॥
কামবীজ উপাসকে শ্রীনন্দনন্দন।

Rāgamayīkaṇā, p. 22.

Now, about the philosophy underlying the conception of these three stages. They are meant for the purification of action and the mind. By recounting the names of Hari, one can get rid of sin. A man in the Taṭastha stage cannot advance to the Sādhaka stage so long as sin remains in him. He alone can get rid of sin who is not influenced by the attractions of the external world. So, a man in the Sādhaka stage must be above the influences of this kind, but if he falls a prey to them, he returns to the Taṭastha stage. One constantly remaining in this stage, is always subject to recurring births and deaths, but he who remains always above worldly attractions, can attain to the perfect stage of Siddhi.[1]

Various Āśrayas.

Connected with this, is the conception of the five kinds of Āśrayas, such as, Nāma, Mantra, Bhāva, Prema and Rasa. The devotees of the Pravarta or the first stage should adopt Nāma and Mantra, and those of the Sādhaka stage, Bhāva and Prema, while in the final stage of the Siddha, they should enjoy Rasa.[2] This means that

1 মন্ত্র হরিনামেতে কলুষ হয় ক্ষয়।
কলুষ থাকিতে সাধ্য সাধক না হয়॥
অতএব সাধক হৈলে বাহ্য নাহি রয়।
বাহ্য হৈলে পুন তারে তটস্থ ঘটয়॥
অতএব তটস্থ যার অহোরাত্রি থাকে।
কর্ম্মসূত্রে লয়ে তাকে ফিরে পাকে পাকে॥
সতত থাকয়ে যার বাহ্য রহিত।
সিদ্ধের সহিত তার সেবায়ে মোহিত॥

Rasasāra, pp. 1-2.

2 আশ্রয় পঞ্চধা হয় শাস্ত্রের বচন।
নামাশ্রয় তার মাঝে জানিবে প্রথম॥

beginning with the recitation of the names of Hari, the devotee should practise with the mystic formula (Mantra), and this will gradually lead to Bhāva, Prema and Rasa in the final stage. In support of this contention, it is said that Śrīnivāsa adopted Nāma as his means, Advaita adhered to Mantra, Nityānanda held fast to Prema, Gadādhara followed Bhāva, and Caitanya took to Rasa.[1] In fact, these are the characteristics of devotional worship in the three stages.

In the Amṛtaratnāvalī, there is also a discussion about the particulars of different stages and Āśrayas. "At first a devotee should be initiated before a Guru, and follow his advice. He should keep to the company of the pious men, which will lead him to the Bhāvāśraya stage. The Āśrayas of Bhāva, Rasa and Prema are attributed to the three stages of Pravarta, Sādhaka, and Siddha. After initiation, the devotee should practise the Mantra he receives from his Guru. This is a feature of the Vaidhī culture which is of 64 kinds. This should be performed in the Pravarta stage. In the Sādhaka stage he should adopt Bhāva, and be guided by the

মন্ত্রাশ্রয় দ্বিতীয়তঃ, পরে ভাবাশ্রয়।
প্রেমাশ্রয়, রসাশ্রয় পঞ্চবিধ হয়॥
নামাশ্রয় প্রথমতঃ করিব বর্ণন।
করিবে গ্রহণ উহা প্রথমে সুজন॥
মন্ত্রাশ্রয় করি পরে বৈরাগ্য সাধিবে।
ভাবাশ্রয় ক্রিয়া পরে করিতে হইবে॥ etc.

Kaḍacā by Svarūpa, pp. 2-3.

নাম আশ্রয়ের পাত্র কে? শ্রীনিবাস পণ্ডিত। মন্ত্র আশ্রয়ের পাত্র কে? আচার্য্য অদ্বৈত। প্রেম আশ্রয়ের পাত্র কে? প্রভু শ্রীনিতাই চাঁদ। রসাশ্রয়ের পাত্র কে? শ্রীশ্রীচৈতন্য মহাপ্রভু। ভাব আশ্রয়ের পাত্র কে? পণ্ডিত শ্রীগদাধর।

Rāgamayīkaṇā, p. 23.

Guru in spiritual culture. This will lead him to the final stage of perfection."[1] Here the author has left out the Nāmāśraya stage, attributing Mantra and Bhāva to the Pravarta stage, while Rasa and Prema to the other two stages.

In the Rādhārasakārikā, the objects of realisation from the three Āśrayas of Nāma, Bhāva and Rasa are narrated thus—" From the Mantrāśraya (otherwise called Nāmāśraya) stage one goes to Vaikuṇṭha, the heaven of Kṛṣṇa, from the Bhāvāśraya stage, one can realise Rādhā who herself symbolises Bhāva or love, and from the Rasāśraya stage one can realise Kṛṣṇa.[2] It is

প্রথমে আশ্রিত হবে মন্ত্রগুরুস্থানে।
গুরু আজ্ঞা পালন করিবে নিজ মনে॥
তার আজ্ঞায় সাধু সঙ্গ করিবার হয়।
তার আজ্ঞা অনুসারে হবে ভাবাশ্রয়॥
ভাবাশ্রয়, রসাশ্রয় আর প্রেমাশ্রয়।
প্রবর্ত্ত, সাধক, সিদ্ধ, তিনে তিন হয়॥
মন্ত্রগুরু দীক্ষা কালে হইবে আশ্রয়।
প্রবর্ত্ত দেহেতে তাহা সাধিবারে হয়॥
সেই সাধনাঙ্গ দেহ চৌষট্টি অঙ্গেতে।
তাহারে বৈধী বলি লিখি যে তাহাতে॥
মন্ত্রাশ্রয় যেই কালে গোত্রান্তর হয়।
শিক্ষা গুরু উপদেশে সাধন করয়॥
ভাবসাধ্য দেহ সাধন অধিকারী।
সাধিবে আশ্রয় তত্ত্ব কিবা পুরুষ নারী॥ etc.

pp. 1-2.

নামাশ্রয়, ভাবাশ্রয়, আর রসাশ্রয়।
এই তিন সাধনে কাহা প্রাপ্তি হয়॥
মন্ত্রের স্বরূপ কৃষ্ণ বৈকুণ্ঠের পতি।
মন্ত্র সিদ্ধ হইলে হয় সেই ধাম প্রাপ্তি॥

further stated that in the Pravarta stage the devotee can experience the full favour of the Guru, in the Sādhaka stage he can comprehend the qualities of the Sakhis of Rādhā, and in the Siddha stage he takes to the services of God.[1]

In the Rasabhakti-Candrikā, Mantrāśraya has been named as Śāntāśraya, and the five Āśrayas have been attributed to the three stages, thus—Nāma and Śānta to the Pravarta stage, Bhāva to the Sādhaka stage, while Prema and Rasa to the Siddha stage.[2] Every stage has further been marked with three characteristics —Āśraya (refuge), Ālamvana (adoption), and Uddīpana (inspiration). In the Pravarta stage, Āśraya is Guru, Ālamvana is the company of the pious men, and Uddīpana is the chanting of the names of Hari. In the Sādhaka stage, Āśraya is the feet of the Sakhīs, Ālamvana is service to them, and Uddīpana is chanting the names of Hari. In the Siddha stage, Āśraya is the feet of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, Ālamvana is the company of the Sakhīs.

ভাবের স্বরূপা হন শ্রীব্রজেন্দ্র-নন্দিনী।
ভাব সিদ্ধ হইলে পায় শ্রীরাধাঠাকুরাণী॥
রসের স্বরূপ ব্রজে যুগল কিশোর।
রস আস্বাদিতে পায় রসিক শেখর॥ p. 5.

1 প্রবর্ত্ত ভাবের প্রাপ্তি শ্রীগুরু-চরণ।
সাধক ভাবের প্রাপ্তি হয় সখীগণ॥
সিদ্ধ ভাবের প্রাপ্তি সেবানুকরণ।
এই তিন হয় এই তিনের করণ॥

Ibid, p. 6.

2 প্রবর্ত্তের নামাশ্রয় শান্তাশ্রয় হয়॥
সাধকের ভাবাশ্রয় জানিহ নিশ্চয়॥
সিদ্ধের প্রেমাশ্রয় রসাশ্রয় আর।

B. T. S., p. 1658.

Uddīpana is of five kinds, such as fresh cloud, black flower, Bhṛṅga (the black bee), cuckoo, and the neck of the peacock (all symbolical of Kṛṣṇa's beauty).[1] Rāgas are also of five kinds. Nāma and Śraddhā are attributed to the Pravarta, Līlā to the Sādhaka, and Prema and Prāpti to the Siddha stages respectively.[2] In the midst of these technicalities of various kinds, the idea that is preached is that the devotee in the Pravarta stage should begin spiritual culture according to some prescribed modes until he rises higher and higher to the final stage of Siddhi, which is characterised by the enjoyment of perpetual bliss.[3]

Various Rāgas.

1 প্রবর্ত্তের আশ্রয় হয় শ্রীগুরু-চরণ।
আলম্বন সাধুসঙ্গ জানিহ কারণ ॥
উদ্দীপন হয় হরিনাম সঙ্কীর্ত্তন।
এইত কহিল কিছু প্রবর্ত্ত লক্ষণ ॥
সাধকের আশ্রয় হয় সখীর চরণ।
সেবা পরিচর্য্যা তার হয় আলম্বন ॥
উদ্দীপন হয় হরিনাম সঙ্কীর্ত্তন।
সিদ্ধেতে আশ্রয় হয় শ্রীরাধাকৃষ্ণ-চরণ।
আলম্বন সখী-সঙ্গ জানিহ কারণ ॥
উদ্দীপন হয় এই পঞ্চ প্রকার।
নবীন মেঘ, কাল পুষ্প, ভৃঙ্গ, কোকিল, আর
ময়ূরকণ্ঠ প্রায়, এই পঞ্চ মত হয়।
B. T. S., pp. 1658-59.

2 প্রবর্ত্তের নাম রাগ শ্রদ্ধারাগ হয়।
সাধকের লীলারাগ লীলাতে চিন্ময় ॥
প্রেমরাগ প্রাপ্তিরাগ সিদ্ধেতে কহিল।
Ibid, p. 1659.

3 নামরাগ হৈতে জাগে শ্রদ্ধার আশ্রয়।
শ্রদ্ধা হৈলে কৃষ্ণচন্দ্র যত্ন করি লয় ॥

In the Sahaja-Tattva (U. M. No. 607) of Rādhā-vallabha Dāsa, there is an elaborate treatment of the various aspects of the Vaidhī culture. It says that the Guru in the Pravarta stage is like Kṛṣṇa, in the Sādhaka stage he is like Lalitā (a female companion of Rādhā), while in the Siddha stage he assumes the nature of Rūpa-Mañjarī (a chief Sakhī of Rādhā).[1] We are also introduced to the idea of time, place and object in connection with the conception of the last two stages. In the Sādhaka stage, the land is Navadvīpa, which is of three kinds, (*i*) the place where the devotee lives, (*ii*) the world consisting of nine islands, and (*iii*) Nadia (the birthplace of Caitanya). The object is here Guru, otherwise called Gaurāṅga. In the Siddha stage, the land is Vṛndāvana which is of three kinds, (*i*) Nava-Vṛndāvana, (*ii*) Mana-Vṛndāvana, and (*iii*) Nitya-Vṛndāvana.[2]

লীলারাগ হৈলে তবে প্রেমরাগ হয়।
প্রেমরাগ হৈলে তবে প্রাপ্তিরাগ হয়॥
প্রাপ্তিরাগ হৈলে সদা আনন্দ বাঢ়য়।

Ibid, p. 1659.

1 প্রবর্ত্ত দেহেতে গুরু কৃষ্ণের স্বরূপ॥
সাধক দেহেতে গুরু ললিতা প্রধান।
সিদ্ধ দেহে গুরু শ্রীরূপমঞ্জরী॥

pp. 1-2.

2 সাধক দেহেতে দেশ কাল পাত্র কারে বলি? দেশ নবদ্বীপ। নবদ্বীপ কারে বলি? ভক্ত বিরাজমান যথা। তাথে বলি নবদ্বীপ। নবখণ্ড পৃথিবীকে নবদ্বীপ বলি। নদিয়াকে নবদ্বীপ বলি। এই তিন নবদ্বীপ বলি। পাত্র তখন গুরু হন।

p. 3.

Putting aside other technicalities of this nature, we come to the classification of Bhakti as treated in this book. Eight kinds of Bhaktis are there described in details:—(1) Vaidhī Bhakti. It is of 64 kinds. Advaita and Haridāsa adopted the principle of this Bhakti. It leads to Vaikuṇṭha. (2) Sevā Bhakti which is based upon Aiśvaryya. Liberality, Yoga, austerities, etc., are its characteristics. It leads to Goloka. It was advocated by Nityānanda. (3) Bhāva Bhakti. It was manifested by Caitanya. (4) Sādhana Bhakti. It brings in the realisation of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. (5) Āropa Bhakti. It was adopted by Dāsa Goswāmī (Raghunāth). It aims at the enjoyment of love, for which God himself appeared in human form. (6) Prema Bhakti It attracts the mind of all. (7) Rāga Bhakti. It lies wholly in the sphere of emotion. (8) Sahaja Bhakti, which is the best of all. It aims at the worship of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, as illustrated by Caitanya.[1]

সিদ্ধ দেহে দেশ কাল পাত্র কাকে বলি ? দেশ বৃন্দাবন। বৃন্দাবন তিন মত প্রকার হন। কি কি ? নব বৃন্দাবন এক। মন বৃন্দাবন দুই। নিত্য বৃন্দাবন তিন।

p. 3.

Also—

দেশ কাল পাত্র হয় ত্রিবিধ প্রকার।
সাধক সিদ্ধ তথি মধ্যে করিএ বিচার ॥
সাধকের দেশ হয় নবদ্বীপ স্থান।
কালাকাল পাত্র শ্রীগৌরাঙ্গ ভগবান ॥
সিদ্ধের দেশ হয় শ্রীবৃন্দাবন।

B. T. S., pp. 1659-60.

[1] বৈধীভক্তি চৌষট্টি অঙ্গ সাধন।
প্রভু অদ্বৈত আদি ব্রহ্ম হরিদাস।
এই ভক্তি যাজন করিলে বৈকণ্ঠেতে বাস ॥

Rāgānugā.

Having thus dealt with some of the characteristic features of the Vaidhī culture, we now come to the sphere of Rāgānugā. It is of two kinds, (*i*) the outer form of culture, in which the devotee, remaining in the Sādhaka stage, should take to listening to religious discourses, and to singing in praise of God; and (*ii*) the mental culture, in which the devotee, remaining in the Siddha stage, should consider himself serving Kṛṣṇa at Vraja, *i.e.*, he should always think of God by adopting various aspects of the

সেবা ভক্তি হয় এক ঐশ্বর্য্য লক্ষণ।
দান যোগ তপ যোগ্য সেবাপরায়ণ॥

গোলোক প্রাপ্তি হয় তার কহেন নিশ্চয়।
সেজনার অধিকারী নিত্যানন্দ রায়॥

আর এক ভাবভক্তি কহি শুন জে।
ভাবভক্তির অধিকারী সর্ব্ব সার।
শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য শচীপুত্র পূর্ণ অবতার॥

আর এক সাধন ভক্তি কহি বিবরিয়া।
সাধনে রাধাকৃষ্ণ পায় ভক্তি নিষ্ঠা হয়া॥

তারপর ভক্তি হয় আরপ সাধন।
ইহার অধিকারী শ্রীদাস গোস্বামী।
নিজকার্য্য প্রেম আস্বাদন এই মনে।
এই কার্য্য লাগি মানুষ আশ্রয় হৈল ভগবানে।
সর্ব্ব চিত্ত আকর্ষয়ে তার নাম প্রেম ভক্তি জানি।
রাগ ভক্তি হয় সেই, সহজ আসি বর্ত্তে তাথে।
আপনার হৃদয়ে তার ভাব বস্তু আনি করে আবর্ত্তন।
সহজ ভক্তি সর্ব্বাদি শ্রেষ্ঠ কহি যে বিবরি।
সহজ ভক্তি হয় রাধাকৃষ্ণের উপাসনা
তাহার আশ্রয় চৈতন্য গোসাঞি জাজনা॥

pp. 4-5.

Mādhuryya love.[1] He will then assume the characteristic feelings of a servant, friend, parent and wife. Thus, with Sānta, which is at the basis of other emotions, this form of Rāgānugā is of 5 kinds : (1) Śānta, (2) Dāsya, (3) Sakhya, (4) Vātsalya, and (5) Madhura.[2] By adopting this mode of culture the mind of a devotee is drawn towards Kṛṣṇa, and thus arises Rati in his mind, which, when condensed, assumes the form of deep love, and gives perpetual bliss.[3]

1 "বাহ্য," "অন্তর" ইহার দুইত সাধন।
বাহ্য—সাধক দেহে করে শ্রবণ কীর্ত্তন॥
মনে—নিজ সিদ্ধ দেহ করিয়া ভাবন।
রাত্রিদিনে করে ব্রজে কৃষ্ণের সেবন॥

Cait. Carit., 2-23.

2 বাহ্য অন্তর দুই মত জাজন।

Sahaja-Tattva, p. 5.

অন্তরে গোপীভাব, বাহ্যে বেদমত।

Ibid, p. 6.

দাস সখা পিত্রাদি প্রেয়সীরগণ।
রাগ মার্গে এইসব ভাবের গণন॥

Cait. Carit., 2-22.

Also Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, 1-2—162.
And

অধিকারীভেদে রতি পঞ্চ প্রকার।
শান্ত, দাস্য, সখ্য, বাৎসল্য, মধুর রতি আর॥

Cait. Carit., 2-23.

3 এই মত করে যেবা রাগানুগাভক্তি।
কৃষ্ণের চরণে তার উপজয় প্রীতি॥
প্রীত্যঙ্কুরে "রতি" "ভাব"—হয় দুই নাম।
যাহা হৈতে বশ হয় শ্রীভগবান॥
কৃষ্ণ রতি গাঢ় হৈলে প্রেম অভিধান।
সেই প্রেম প্রয়োজন—সর্ব্বানন্দ ধাম॥

Cait. Carit., 2-22—23.

As the Sahajiyā doctrine is mainly Rāgānugā in character, we shall have to deal with the other features of this aspect of culture at almost every step of our progress. Even the essence of Rāgānugā has been infused in the Vaidhī culture with the adoption of the ideal of Parakīyā love. So, we can hardly dispense with the Rāgānugā element in our further treatment of the subject. This being the case, we pass over to the next chapter without dwelling more on Rāgānugā at this stage.

CHAPTER II

PARAKĪYĀ AND SVAKĪYĀ

Sahajiyā and Parakīyā.

The ideal of Parakīyā is ingrained in the Sahajiyā doctrine. It may properly be regarded as the very foundation whereon rests the mystic edifice of the spiritual culture of the Sahajiyās. For this reason the terms Sahajiyā and Parakīyā are used almost in an identical sense. Even in Vaiṣṇavism the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, which has a higher spiritual significance, has been interpreted on the Parakīyā ideal. Parakīyā is, therefore, an important factor both in the doctrine of the Sahajiyās as well as of the later Vaiṣṇavas of Bengal.

Definitions.

Parakīyā literally means "pertaining or belonging to another," and hence the culture called Parakīyā which is followed by the Sahajiyās, means the observance of mystic practices in the company of women other than one's wedded wife, specially with a married woman whose husband is living. In the Vaiṣṇava poetics with which we are chiefly concerned here, Parakīyā has been defined, while referring to a member of the weaker sex, as the woman who disregarding merits, either in this world or in the next, gives herself up for love to a man with whom she has not been formally or properly married.[1] In the same way, a man is said to have adopted Parakīyā who, without caring for the time-honoured custom, loves a woman

[1] Ujjvalanīlamaṇi, Kṛṣṇa-Vallabhā, 6.

with whom he has not been formally married, but whose love is the only object of his anxious solicitude.[1] Moreover, the term Parakīyā is often used in contrast to Svakīyā which, when applied to a woman, means a lawfully married wife who is always ready to carry out the wishes of her husband for whom she cherishes unqualified love.[2] Thus, we find that love is the most essential factor even in the Parakīyā union. In the same way, it is also quite clear that mere marriage does not imprint on a woman the character of a true Svakīyā mate unless she loves her husband, and has absolute resignation to him. Love is, therefore, the characteristic feature either with a Svakīyā or a Parakīyā couple. Without love Svakīyā is meaningless, but Parakīyā degenerates into gross sensuality. Whenever the Vaiṣṇavas speak of Parakīyā in religious matters, it should be understood that the idea is always associated with love. In the pre-Caitanya period the orthodox school regarded Parakīyā as a questionable union and discarded it. The earlier works on poetics have dealt with this matter as briefly as possible, sometimes simply referring to it only in connection with the description of Svakīyā.[3] But the post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavas have changed this aspect of Parakīyā by adopting its ideal for religious purpose, the background of love being insisted upon. This was a decided exaltation on the conception of Parakīyā as we shall presently see.

1 *Ibid*, Nāyaka-Bheda, 11.

2 *Ibid*, Kṛṣṇa-Vallabhā, 3.

3 Sāhitya-Darpaṇa, 96, 108—110; Sṛṅgāratilaka, I. 46, 87; Kāvyālaṁkāra, XII.16, 30; Ratirahasya, I.27; Sāhityasāra, X.2, etc.

We are concerned with the Parakīyā ideal in religion only.

It should be observed that the term Parakīyā is ordinarily applied to designate the union of man and woman (who are not united by the bond of marriage), not necessarily for religious practices but for the purpose of living a family life, and it may sometimes be even for improper gratification. It cannot also be denied that even among those who are called Sahajiyās there are persons who take one or more Prakṛtis or Mañjarīs, *i.e.*, women who live with men bound by a sort of temporary contract which has neither the compulsion nor the absolute dependence of married life. These are arrangements of convenience, "marriages" of a more or less temporary character which, if the parties find suitable, may be made lasting for some time, but we are not concerned with all that in this place. We shall here deal with that aspect of religious practices wherein Parakīyā is advocated for spiritual culture only, but not for any other motive, and our readers should constantly bear in mind that they are going to peep into the secrets of a doctrine meant for the culture of love, beauty and bliss on the Parakīyā ideal.

Parakīyā in Vaiṣṇavism.

The ideal of Parakīyā crept into the Vaiṣṇava theology from the legend of the love and amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. The popular belief is that Rādhā was the wife of Āyan (Aihaṇa or Abhimanya) who was a rich herdsman of Vraja, and she fell in love with Kṛṣṇa who is regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Hence the Vaiṣṇavas who are the worshippers of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa can hardly dispense with the ideal of Parakīyā manifested in the love of these two lovers who are their great examplars. But they generally take it in this sense that God is to be loved with as much intensity and fervour

as Rādhā, a married woman with many things to lose, loved Kṛṣṇa sacrificing everything else for the object of her love. Thus, the legend teaches the Vaiṣṇavas entire resignation in divine love, and this is the true spirit in which the Vaiṣṇava writers interpret the significance of the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. This love, the Vaiṣṇavas maintain, was practically demonstrated by Caitanya Deva in his own life. His frequent love trances, wailings for union with God, and the laments of separation are said to be the external manifestations of the fervent divine love which was consuming his soul. So great was the emotion in him that he would often forget himself at the sight of a blue cloud or a dark Tamāla tree as he was thus reminded of the dark colour of Kṛṣṇa's body, and the view of the river Yamunā associated with the legend of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa would often bring down tears of emotion from his eyes. This led the devout Vaiṣṇavas to believe that Caitanya was born with the soul of Rādhā in him. It is said—"Kṛṣṇa was born in the womb of Śacī with the emotions of Rādhā in order to feel for himself how deeply he was loved by her, to realise how charmingly fascinating was his beauty which made Rādhā mad with love, and lastly, to taste the pleasure which was experienced by Rādhā when united with him."[1] This is the basis of the conception of the incarnation of Caitanya, which has been adopted by all the Vaiṣṇava writers of the post-Caitanya period.

[1] শ্রীরাধায়াঃ প্রণয়মহিমা কীদৃশো বানয়ৈবা-
স্বাদ্যো যেনাদ্ভুতমধুরিমা কীদৃশো বা মদীয়ঃ।
সৌখ্যং চাস্যা মদনুভবতঃ কীদৃশং বেতি লোভা-
ত্তদ্ভাবাঢ্যঃ সমজনি শচীগর্ভসিন্ধৌ হরীন্দুঃ ॥

Parakīyā ideal adopted by the Sahajiyās.

The Sahajiyās have also adopted this interpretation of the birth of Caitanya. Rāgamayīkaṇā says—" Nārāyaṇa was born in the womb of Śacī with the body and emotions of Rādhā." [1] Rasasāra says—" Kṛṣṇa was born in this world as Caitanya Deva in order to taste the love and emotions of Rādhā." [2] In the Amṛtarasāvalī we have—" As Kṛṣṇa never experienced in his mind the impulses of transcendental love, so he took birth in the womb of Śacī." [3] These are the interpretations which the Vaiṣṇavas as well as the Sahajiyās put upon the incarnation of Caitanya Deva. The Parakīyā love of Rādhā has thus been utilised to set forth a noble ideal of divine love illustrated in the life of the saint of Nadīā. The doctrine that is now advocated by the followers of Caitanya cannot, therefore, be separated from the ideal of Parakīyā.

Attempts at justification.

The Vaiṣṇavas were quite cognisant of the fact that Parakīyā is a bad ideal in society, and that when it is admitted as a principle in religion there is no limit to the harm it can do. So, they have tried to remove the objections

রাধা কৃষ্ণপ্রণয়বিকৃতির্হ্লাদিনী শক্তিরস্মা-
দেকাত্মানাবপি ভুবি পুরা দেহভেদং গতৌ তৌ।
চৈতন্যাখ্যং প্রকটমধুনা তদ্দ্বয়ং চৈক্যমাপ্তং
রাধাভাবদ্যুতিসুবলিতং নৌমি কৃষ্ণস্বরূপম্ ॥

Kaḍacā by Svarūpa.

[1] জন্মে নারায়ণ শচীগর্ভেতে আসিয়া।
ভাব-কান্তি রাধিকার ভূষণ করিয়া ॥ p. 11.

[2] অবতরি ভূমণ্ডলে চৈতন্যরূপেতে।
শ্রীরাধিকা-ভাব-কান্তি-প্রেম আস্বাদিতে ॥ p. 6.

[3] অকৈতব প্রেমবস্তু নহে আস্বাদন।
এই লাগী শচীগর্ভে লভিল জনম ॥ p. 4.

that can be urged against the Parakīyā idea in the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. They have advanced various philosophical arguments in justification of the innate purity of their faith in spite of its apparent Parakīyā complexion. In the Ujjvalanīlamaṇi, Rūpa Gosvāmī writes—"The Gopīs were accepted by Kṛṣṇa according to the Gāndharva mode (the custom of marriage based on free love) of union, so they were really Svakīyās but not Parakīyās."[1] It is also maintained—"As Rādhā is the embodiment of the faculty of joy (Ānanda) which (with *sat* and *cit*) is a constituent element of Kṛṣṇa (*Sāc-cid-ānanda*), so his union with her can never be a Parakīyā union."[2] Kṛṣṇadās Kavirāj has adopted the same view for the purpose of explaining the questionable character of the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa—"Rādhā represents the Hlādinī or bliss-giving faculty of Kṛṣṇa. Though separate in external appearance, there is really no difference between them."[3] The argument seems to be this—Just as the union of the hand with the body is not an unnatural union, so it is with that of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, for the former is really a part of the latter. This favourite conception of the Vaiṣṇavas is always

The argument of marriage.

The argument of the union of the part with the whole.

1 Ujjvalaṇīlmani, Kṛṣṇa-Vallabhā, 5.

2 শ্রীরাধা হি কৃষ্ণস্য স্বরূপভূতাহ্লাদিনী শক্তিরেব তস্যাঃ বস্তুতঃ স্বীয়াত্বমেব নতু পরকীয়াত্বম্ ঘটতে।

Ibid, Notes on śloka 16, Chap. I.

3 রাধিকা হয়েন কৃষ্ণের প্রণয় বিকার।
স্বরূপ শক্তি হ্লাদিনী নাম যাহার॥

And

রাধাকৃষ্ণ ঐছে সদা একই স্বরূপ। Canto I, Chap. IV.

held mystically sacred by them, transcending all earthly things.

Copied by the Sahajiyās.

Even the Sahajiyā writers have exactly copied from these authorities. In the Rāgamayīkaṇā we have—"Rādhā incarnates the element of joy that is in Kṛṣṇa."[1] In the Premānanda-Laharī we get—"Though they are separate in external appearance they have but one soul between them. Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa form an undivided entity."[2] The writer of the Rasasāra puts forth the argument thus—"As the limbs are to the body, so is Rādhā to Kṛṣṇa,"[3] proving thereby that their union is, therefore, free from the blame which would attach to the idea of Parakīyā in the society.

The argument of miraculous power.

Even the influence of the miraculous powers of Kṛṣṇa has been advanced as an argument to make the Kṛṣṇa-ideal free from the questionable character of Parakīyā in the matter of the love of the Gopīs for him. In the Bhāgavata we have—"Though the Gopīs used to visit Kṛṣṇa in the forest, yet their husbands bore no spite against him, for they always felt the presence of their wives near them, so overwhelmed they were by the miraculous powers of Kṛṣṇa."[4] In the Ujjvalanīlamaṇi

[1] আহ্লাদিনী রূপিণী রাধিকা আনন্দাংশে। p. 16.

[2] দোহার যে একমন ভিন্ন নাহি হয়।
দুইরূপ এক আত্মা শাস্ত্রে নিরূপয়॥
যথা রাধা তথা কৃষ্ণ অপূর্ব্ব মূরতি। p. 4.

[3] নিজাঙ্গ সঙ্গ বশে ভিন্ন অঙ্গ নয়।
আত্মসঙ্গি তত্ত্বাঙ্গি ভিন্ন নাহি কয়॥ p. 42.

[4] নাসূয়ন্ খলু কৃষ্ণায় মোহিতাস্তস্য মায়য়া।
মন্যমানাঃ স্বপার্শ্বস্থান্ স্বান্ স্বান্ দারান্ ব্রজৌকসঃ॥ 10-33-37.

Rūpa writes—"The Gopīs were no doubt married to other persons, but they had no experience of physical union with them. When they would go to the tryst to meet with Kṛṣṇa, their husbands thought that their wives were in their houses, for they could always see the forms of Gopīs created by illusion there."[1] This rather naive defence of the ways of the Lord as being full of miracle and mystery is after all due to an uneasy sense of the questionable character of the figure of Parakīyā from the point of view of social ethics.

The argument of Kaiśora love.

Parakīyā is bad because of sensuality that it would seem to involve. The Vaiṣṇava writers have also tried to remove this objection (based on the ground of Parakīyā being merely a means of gratification of the senses), which can be directed against the love of Kṛṣṇa for Rādhā and the Gopīs. In the first place it is maintained that the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa had its play when both of them were in their Kaiśora stage. This is the period of life when the child steps into the first youth, which is, therefore, called Vayaḥsandhi, or the confluence of youth and childhood, by the Vaiṣṇava poets and rhetoricians, and Rādhā is termed Kiśorī, which is the characteristic appellation by which she is often designated. This is the childishly romantic age when love presents itself in glowing colours before the fertile imagination of youth at its dawn.[2] In the Bhakti-

[1] মায়াকল্পিত-তাদৃক্-স্ত্রীশীলনেনানুসূয়িভিঃ।
ন জাতু ব্রজদেবীনাং পতিভিঃ সহ সঙ্গমঃ॥
Kṛṣṇavallabhā, 19-20.

[2] কৈশোর বয়স কাম জগত সকল।
Cait. Carit., 1-4.

rasāmṛtasindhu, Rūpa says—"Kaiśora is the best time when pure love grows in the mind."[1] Caṇḍīdāsa and Vidyāpati, and a host of other Vaiṣṇava poets sang mainly of the Kaiśora love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.[2] Mukunda Deva, who is one of the earliest Sahajiyā writers, is of opinion that the love of Kaiśora is the most perfect type of love that exists between man and woman.[3] This sort of love, Caṇḍīdāsa says, is entirely free from the element of Kāma or sensuality, although the sex plays a great part in the attraction.[4] In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, Kṛṣṇa Dāsa writes—"The natural love of the Gopīs should not be mistaken for carnal desire, though it is

[1] শ্রেষ্ঠমুজ্জ্বলমেবাস্ত কৈশোরস্থ, etc.

Dakṣiṇa, 1-159.

[2] নবীন কিশোরী মেঘের বিজুরি
চমকি চাহিয়ে গেল। etc.

Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī (P. E.), p. 3.

রাজার ঝিয়ারি বয়সে কিশোরী
তাহে কুলবতী বালা।

Ibid, p. 30.

শৈশব যৌবন দুহু মেলি গেল। etc.

Vidyāpati's Padāvalī (P. E.), p. 2.

এপার বরিষে কাহ্নাঞি বার নাহি পুরে।

Kṣṛṇa-kīrttana, p. 58.

[3] কিশোর বয়স নিত্য প্রেমের স্বরূপ।

Ādya-Sārasvata-Kārikā, p. 4.

[4] রজকিনী রূপ কিশোরী স্বরূপ
কামগন্ধ নাহি তায়।
রজকিনী প্রেম নিকষিত হেম
বড়ু চণ্ডীদাস গায়॥

Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī (P. E.), Song No. 769.

generally called Kāma for the sake of an apt simile."[1] In the Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu it is said that the love of the Gopīs is usually designated by the term Kāma.[2] The argument becomes rather mystifying when we find that Kṛṇṣa, according to the Bhāgavata, had dalliance and intimate union with thousands of the Gopīs during the Rāsa night, although, as a miracle-working God, he had no loss of energy.[3]

All such attempts to remove the obloquy of Kāma from the love of Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs, and to transform Parakīyā into Svakīyā by philosophical arguments, are the outcome of a firm conviction which fixes upon Svakīyā the stamp of social approval. Svakīyā or the wedded faithfulness has the support of the Śāstras primarily for the preservation of the social order, but the matter assumes a different character when it concerns the lovers who desire to culture love for spiritual advancement, as we have it in a Sahajiyā manuscript preserved in the University of Calcutta, which says that Svakīyā is adopted for the purpose of procreation, but not for the culture of love by the lovers.[4] Similarly, in the Ujjvala-nīlamaṇi we have—"The supreme Rati or love

1 সহজে গোপীর প্রেম নহে প্রাকৃত কাম।
কামক্রীড়া সাম্যে তারে কহে কাম নাম॥
Canto II, Chap. 8.

2 প্রেমৈব গোপরামাণাং কাম ইত্যগমৎ প্রথামিতি। 2. 143.

3 এবং শশাঙ্কাংশুবিরাজিতা নিশাঃ স সত্যকামোঽনুরতাবলাগণঃ।
সিষেব আত্মন্যবরুদ্ধসৌরতঃ সর্ব্বাঃ শরৎকাব্যকথারসাশ্রয়াঃ॥ 10-33-26.

4 তাহারে স্বকীয়া বলি বলে শাস্ত্রে।
সৃষ্টির কারণ সেই, নহে প্রেম পাত্রে॥
U. M. No. 594, p. 3.

against which there are injunctions in society as well as in the Śāstras for its being tinged with grossness, is given an inferior position so far as the men (of society) are concerned, but not in respect of matters spiritual."[1] It is with the culture of this sort of spiritual love that we are chiefly concerned here. We shall, therefore, leave aside the Śāstric injunctions about Svakīyā and Parakīyā, and see eye to eye with the Sahajiyās in order to find out the reasons they advance in support of Parakīyā in a doctrine meant for the culture of love, beauty and bliss. The arguments adduced for the necessity of taking a woman as a Śakti or accomplice in the path of spiritual culture are many and of a varied nature. These should be considered first before entering into the defence of the superiority of the Parakīyās over the Svakīyās.

Reasons advanced for taking female companions.

Analyse the nature of man, and you will find that there is a strong natural desire for union with woman. Lust (Kāma) is like a serpent residing in our body which it is constantly biting, and man is hardly able to check this evil tendency.[2] Besides, in this Kali or Iron Age,

1 বহু বার্য্যতে যতঃ খলু যত্র প্রচ্ছন্নকামুকত্বঞ্চ।
যা চ মিথো দুর্লভতা, সা মন্মথস্য পরমা রতিঃ॥
লঘুত্বমত্র যৎ প্রোক্তং তত্তু প্রাকৃত নায়কে।
ন কৃষ্ণে রসনির্য্যাসস্বাদার্থমবতারিণি॥

1-15-16.

২ শরীর ভিতরে জান আছে কাল সর্প॥
সেই সর্পে দিবানিশি করিছে দংশন।
কাম নিবারিতে নারে জীব নরাধম॥

Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 6.

both men and women are greatly influenced by lust, which, with greed, is the cause of much mischief.[1] Upon the destruction of this Kāma primarily depends the growth of Prema (love).[2] This leads us to the enquiry as to the nature of Kāma and Prema, and what is the difference between them.

(a) Suppression of Kāma or lust.

The attraction which men and women feel for mutual union is usually called Prema or love. Even the most selfish tendency of gratification, however gross it may be, is sometimes called love (Prema); so, one must be very careful to distinguish between Kāma and Prema. The real difference between them lies only in the mode of action, *i.e.*, in form, but not in essence.[3] Now, it is a well-known idea that selfish desire leads to self-gratification or Kāma, while selfless devotion is the basis of love or Prema.[4] "The manner of doing it determines the nature of the thing. Rightly performed it is right and honourable, wrongly, it is wrong and dishonourable."[5]

1 প্রকৃতি পুরুষ কলিকালে হবে কামী।
কাম লোভ দুই রিপু হইবে প্রবল।
এই দুই রিপু ধর্ম্ম নাশিবে সকল॥

Rasasāra, p. 44.

2 কাম গন্ধহীন হইলে গোপীভাব পায়।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 89.

3 প্রেম-অমৃত কাম রহে এক ঠাঁই।
মিলনে একত্রে সে স্বরূপ ভিন্ন নাই॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 49.

4 আত্মেন্দ্রিয় প্রীতি ইচ্ছা তারে বলি কাম।
কৃষ্ণেন্দ্রিয় প্রীতি ইচ্ছা ধরে প্রেম নাম॥

Cait. Carit., 1-4.

5 Selections from Plato, edited by T. W. Rolleston, p. 46.

So every love is not generous or noble, but there is a sort of love which is truly vulgar. The latter is called Kāma while what is noble is called Prema. Moreover the selfish desire seeks only the pleasure of the body, and is devoid of constancy.[1] So, the chief characteristics of Kāma are—(*i*) the gratification of passion by means of enjoyment, (*ii*) attachment to body, (*iii*) absence of constancy, and (*iv*) adoption of selfish motive in lieu of selfless action. In order to step into the domain of Prema, these things should be avoided at all costs. But how can this be effected? The religious books (Śāstras) advocate the eradication of passions by study, learning, wisdom, austere practices and the like, but the Vaiṣṇavas as well as the Sahajiyās are, it is well-known, of opinion that the functions of the physical senses should not by force be destroyed, but be used for the noble purpose of realising God.[2] Eyes, ears, nose, etc., should be employed in the service of God, and the six senses, the six natural enemies of our body (*i. e.*, lust, anger, greed, etc.), should be controlled by administering charming doses of pleasure, but not destroy-

[1] জীবের বিষয় মাত্র যাতে দেহ সুখ।
আত্মসুখে ফিরে জীব, সাধনে বিমুখ ॥
রতিখণ্ড নিরবধি পাপাদি করিয়া।
এই দুই দোষে ফিরে চোরারা ভ্রমিয়া ॥

Viv.-Vilā., p. 76.

[2] অন্যবাঞ্ছা অন্যপূজা ছাড়ি জ্ঞান কর্ম্ম।
আনুকূল্য সর্ব্বেন্দ্রিয়ে কৃষ্ণানুশীলন ॥
এই শুদ্ধ ভক্তি, ইহা হৈতে প্রেম হয়।
পঞ্চ রাত্র ভাগবতে এই লক্ষণ কয় ॥

Viv.-Vilā., p. 63.

ed by means of forced austerities.[1] As for lust, it is said that "It is not until lust is expanded and eradicated that it develops into the exquisite and enthralling flower of love."[2]

In the Sahajiyā mode of practical culture the company of women is advocated for the training of this passion (Kāma). They (women) are usually regarded as undesirable associates for the holy men, and their character is sometimes depicted in the darkest colour in order to create a feeling of disgust against them. The Mahābhārata and the Yoga-Vāśiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa each devotes a whole chapter to the enumeration of the evil qualities of women.[3] Even in the West, specially in the mediæval period, there had been regular vilifying of the beauty of women. "If we could see beneath the skin women would arouse nothing but nausea. Their adornments are but blood and mucus and bile. If we refuse to touch dung and phlegm even with a finger-tip, how can we desire to embrace a sack of dung."[4] In all doctrines of renunciation, "the sexual life is always the first impulse to be sacrificed

1 চক্ষু কর্ণ নাসিকা বদন গুহ্য লিঙ্গ হস্ত।
দেখহ আছয়ে অঙ্গে ইন্দ্রিয় সমস্ত ॥
আনুকূল্য কহি যাতে কৃষ্ণসুখ সেবা।
রসিক ভকত বিনে তা করিতে পারে কেবা ॥

And—

ছয় রিপু হিংসা করি কর উপকার।
সুখ দিয়া মারিলে সে প্রেমের সঞ্চার ॥

Viv.-Vilā., pp. 63, 97.

2 Psychology of Sex, by H. Ellis, Vol. VI, p. 133.

3 Chaps., 32 and 21 respectively.

4 Psych. of Sex, by H. Ellis, Vol. VI, p. 119.

to the passion for renunciation." Hence the saints like Buddha and Caitanya, and the early Christian ascetics tried to avoid women as far as possible. But why all this hostility to women? Not because the woman is evil in herself, but because the man is so weak that he cannot restrain his passion and his sensual cravings. Conscious of their own inability to check themselves while in the company of the women, men with spiritual ideals flee from women in terror like the frightened deer and go to forest or live in seclusion for the purpose of leading a pure life. But the Sahajiyās take the opposite course. Instead of forsaking women, they rather observe certain mystic practices with them according to some prescribed mode in order to make their mind a proof against temptation. They maintain that when the mind is satisfied by the culture of Kāma, then only can the right knowledge about Kāma arise in the mind.[1] For this reason, they attach great importance to this sort of culture. "The first concern of a devotee is to culture Rati in the company of women. By regulated companionship uncontrolled desire is controlled, and the cravings of flesh and blood pass away making room for the growth of love."[2] It should be noted here that lust can no doubt be subdued to some extent by austere

[1] যখন সাধিয়া কাম পূর্ণ হয় মনে।
তবেত স্বরূপ কামবস্তুতত্ত্ব জানে॥

Rasakadamvakalikā, p. 11.

[2] প্রথম সাধন রতি সম্ভোগ শৃঙ্গার।
সাধিবে সম্ভোগ রতি পালাবে বিকার॥
জীবরতি দূরে যাবে করিলে সাধন।
তারপর প্রেমরতি করি নিবেদন॥

Amṛtaratnāvalī, pp. 6-7.

practices, but it may re-appear if the temptation be sufficiently strong, as has been proved in the cases of the saints like Viśvāmitra, Parāśara and others, whereas the cure effected by the Sahajiyā means is considered most radical.

The thing can be logically viewed from another standpoint also. The object is to give up Kāma, and adopt Prema. Now, the person who has not tasted quinine, cannot reasonably say how bitter it is; similarly, the man who has not tasted mango cannot say how sweet it tastes. Such declarations depend fully on practical experiences. Thus, one must have perfect knowledge of Kāma and Prema before he can say that he dislikes the one, and likes the other. As for love, it is clearly maintained that it cannot be known by much learning, nor by hearing or reading the Śāstras, unless one practises love in the company of one who knows how to love.[1] Book instruction, as for instance in the art of fighting, cannot make a man a veteran soldier unless he has engaged himself in actual fighting.

(b) The culture of Prema.

So, the Sahajiyās believe that the Mādhuryya culture peculiar to Vraja can only be practised in the company of the living women of flesh and blood, otherwise mere theoretical knowledge cannot create any realistic impression in the mind, just as the thing which has not been seen with eyes, can-

[1] পড়িলে শুনিলে প্রেম ভক্তি নাহি পাই।
সাধন ভজন করি নিত্যধামে যাই ॥
শাস্ত্র পড়ি চক্ষুদান যেই জন বলে।
ভাবশূন্য তারে রাধাকৃষ্ণ নাহি মিলে ॥
রসিকের সঙ্গ কর মন জুড়াইবে।

Viv.-Vilā., p. 54.

not be faithfully pictured in the mind.[1] Moreover, the enjoyment of an object, and the knowledge of its nature, are two things which are quite different. Enjoyment is merely the function of the senses, but knowledge is based upon intelligent realisation. One may wear gold ornaments, but may not know the true nature of gold. So, the Sahajiyās maintain that regular culture of love in the company of woman is an absolute necessity for knowing the secret of love, so much so that without such culture no one can become a true lover, an appreciator of the flavour of love (Rasika).[2]

(c) For the culture of beauty and bliss also.

What is thus true of love, is true of beauty and bliss also, for all the three go together. "Love by nature loves beauty, and all beauty is the object of love." Love also desires to have bliss in perpetual possession. So, love, beauty and bliss are so closely related with one another

1 সাক্ষাৎ নহিলে কৈছে হবে রূপায় ।
বর্ত্তমান বিনে ব্রজে উপাসনা নয় ॥

And—

পুনঃ কহি বর্ত্তমান সাধন ভজন ।
নয়নে না দেখি কৈছে করিবে সাধন ॥
যাহা কোন কালে বস্তু না দেখি নয়নে ।
তাহাকে কেমন করি আরোপিব মনে ॥

Viv.-Vilā., pp. 67, 142.

Also

বস্তু বৈ দূরে রহে নাহি জানে রতি ।
প্রাপ্তি তার কাঁহা হয় এ ভাব পীরিতি ॥

B. T. S., p. 1669.

সাধনে ভিয়ান করে প্রেমের কারণে ।

And—

হেন সাধন বিনে কেহ রসিক্ না হয় ।

Viv.-Vilā., pp. 83-84.

that the culture of one brings in the perfection of the other two. They can be cultured to some extent in other objects of nature, but women are considered to be the best media for men for the culture of all the three. In a technical way the argument can be put thus. The bright moon can gladden the heart of a man, but he cannot fall in love with it in the same manner as he can love a woman, for true love can only be generated between objects of the same class.[1] Man by nature is so constituted that he can even see "Helen's beauty in the brow of Egypt." The mysterious pleasure that results from the union of man and woman is unique in its nature,[2] and love, however gross it may be, is the guiding principle in such a union. Women, therefore, possess all the characteristics favourable for the culture of love, beauty and bliss, so far as men are concerned. The necessity of a female companion is thus established at least in the primary stage of culture.

(d) For worship based upon Mādhuryya.

Another important reason advanced for taking a female companion in spiritual culture can be traced from the peculiar conception of the Vaiṣṇavas about the nature of worship that they consider pleasing to God. We shall deal with this matter in detail when we come to trace the history of

[1] পীরিতি রতন করিব যতন
যদি সমানে সমানে হয়।
Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī, Song No. 783.

[2] আনন্দের অনুভব যদি চাহ ভাই।
অপূর্ব্ব রতির সুখ আনন্দ হয় তাই॥
প্রকৃতি লইয়া তার করহ সাধন।
প্রেমানন্দে মজিবারে যদি চাহ মন॥
Premānanda-Laharī, pp. 8-9.

the origin and development of the modern Sahajiyā cult, but a brief reference to it in this place will no doubt be very useful. We refer to two kinds of worship adopted by following (1) the mode of Aiśvaryya, and (2) that of Mādhuryya.[1] The former means the worship of god based upon the conception of his supernatural faculties and his majesty, which kind of approach, it is maintained, is never pleasing to God.[2] But the latter, that is, what lies in the Mādhuryya sphere, is based upon the ideal that God is to be loved with the sentiment either of a mother, friend, servant, or wife, and this kind of worship, it is said, is liked by God.[3] The latter is thus the intensely personal relationship with God. Now, among worships based upon these four kinds of emotions, that which looks upon God as the great lover is considered the best of all.[4] The Vaiṣṇavas as well as the Sahajiyās are the followers of this principle, and so they say that the best form of worship is that wherein God is loved just as a woman loves her lover. This idea of love existing between man and woman adopted in divine

[1] ঐশ্বর্য্য মাধুর্য্য রসে ভক্ত মাত্র দ্বয়।

Rasasāra, p. 12.

[2] ঐশ্বর্য্য শিথিল প্রেমে নাহি মোর প্রীত।

Cait. Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

[3] মোর পুত্র মোর সখা মোর প্রাণপতি।
এই ভাবে করে যেই মোরে শুদ্ধ ভক্তি॥
আপনাকে বড় মানে আমারে সম হীন।
সেই ভাবে হই আমি তাহার অধীন॥

Ibid.

[4] সর্ব্বরস হৈতে শৃঙ্গারে অধিক মাধুরি।

Cait. Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

worship is the very basis of modern Vaiṣṇavism prevalent in Bengal, and herein also lies the foundation of the conception of Svakīyā and Parakīyā in spiritual culture. For the practical realisation in life of the doctrine established on this ideal, woman is an absolutely necessary factor, so much so that without her it would be something like the performance of the Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. Herein also lies the justification of the practice of taking female companions for spiritual culture.

(e) For the benefit of the lustful.

There are, indeed, persons in this world who are addicted to passions. Society discards them, religion is not so very sympathetic towards them. One reason advanced in support of the Parakīyā is that it attracts to religious things the mind of those who are thus not in the right path. The legend of the love amours of Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndāvana has been interpreted on the Parakīyā basis, and it is said that Parakīyā is the characteristic feature of the Dvāpara Age, the millennium when Kṛṣṇa lived on the earth, and of the Madhura Rasa specially manifested in the Vraja, the place of his early life.[1] The following verse of the Bhāgavata is often found quoted in the Sahajiyā books in support of the practical utility of the idea of this Parakīyā of Vṛndāvana :—

অনুগ্রহায় ভক্তানাং মানুষদেহমাশ্রিতঃ।
ভজতে তাদৃশীঃ ক্রীড়া যাঃ শ্রুত্বা তৎপরো ভবেৎ॥
10-33-36.

The celebrated annotator Śrīdhara Svāmī in his explanation of this verse says — Why should God adopt

[1] যুগ ধর্ম্ম পরকীয়া দ্বাপরে জানিবে।
and ব্রজের মাধুর্য্য রস পরকীয়া হয়।
Ratnasāra, pp. 3, 4.

Parakīyā which is after all a questionable practice? Because there are persons in this world who are addicted to the pleasure of the senses; in order to attract the mind of these people to religious subject by means suited to their taste, God played the part of a Parakīyā lover in Vṛndāvana.[1] The utility of the Parakīyā ideal as a coming down of the deity from the unattainable pedestal of absolute moral purity and grandeur to the level of the common herd, is thus interpreted as having happened at least for the welfare of those who are fallen in the eye of religion. This is a very sympathetic treatment of human weakness. Indian thought has not considered this attitude morally reprehensible if it is for the good of the weak and the fallen who cannot be reclaimed by urging them to follow too high an ideal much above their capacity.

(f) For the dawn of love.

The Sahajiyās believe that spiritual emancipation can only be effected through love only, so their first concern is to create love in the mind. The easiest means to do this, it is said, is to love a woman. If this love be at first very gross in character it may gradually lead to the highest perfection. The Rasasāra says—" The first impulse of love can grow in the mind from a desire of the Parakīyā union. Accept the woman whoever she may be, whose beauty can captivate your mind. You will thus experience a feeling which is called Purva-rāga or the Dawn of Love, the gradual development of which will ultimately lead to the 32 nobler sentiments, for it is said that the emotion Rati is the mother of all other emotions. It leads to Prema, Prema to Sneha, Sneha to Praṇaya, Praṇaya to

[1] শৃঙ্গাররসাকৃষ্টচেতসো বহির্মুখাস্তপি স্বপরানি কর্ত্তুমিতি ভাবঃ।

Rāga, Rāga to Anurāga, and the latter to the Mahābhāva." [1]

In this theory of the gradual evolution of sentiments, the Sahajiyās have worked on the principle of the classification of emotions as followed in works like the Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, Caitanya Caritāmṛta, etc.[2] Therein we find that emotions are of 8 kinds—Rati, Prema, Sneha, Māna, Praṇaya, Rāga, Anurāga, and Mahābhāva. Each of them has been further subdivided into four finer sentiments, making up a total of 32

[1] সর্ব্বশ্রেষ্ঠ পূর্ব্বরাগ যাহা হৈতে প্রাপ্তি।
পরকীয়া রসের রসিক জন গতি ॥
রূপ লাবণ্য যার দেখি জন্মে ক্ষোভ।
প্রাপ্তি কারণে সদা চিত্তে হয় লোভ ॥
পূর্ব্বরাগের ঘর এই সদা চিন্ত মনে।
* * * *
বিংশতি দ্বাদশ রস ইহার পোষক ॥
p. 13.

প্রথমতঃ রতিভাব বীজবত কয়।
তদুপরি হয় প্রেম ইক্ষুবত সম।
স্নেহ হয় রস তার এই অতিক্রম ॥
মানে গুড়বত হয় শুনহ বচন।
প্রণয় খণ্ডসম করি যে গণন ॥ etc.
p. 29.

[2] *Vide* Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, 1-3-11.

And প্রেম ক্রমে বাড়ে, হয়—স্নেহ, মান, প্রণয়।
রাগ, অনুরাগ, ভাব, মহাভাব হয় ॥
বীজ ইক্ষুরস গুড়, তবে খণ্ড সার।
শর্করা সিতামিশ্রী, শুদ্ধমিশ্রী আর ॥
ইহা যৈছে ক্রমে নির্ম্মল, ক্রমে বাড়ে স্বাদ।
রতিপ্রেমাদিক তৈছে, বাড়য়ে আস্বাদ ॥
Cait. Carit., 2-23.

in all. But among the principal eight kinds of emotions, Rati is said to be the root of the other seven which can be traced to the gradual perfection of this Rati. Just as from the seed or sapling grows sugar-cane, which yields the juice from which molasses is made, and from molasses are prepared sugar, sugar-candy, and other finer varieties of the original product (the sugar-cane juice), so from Rati grow Prema, Sneha, Māna, Praṇaya, etc., leading up to Mahābhāva in the highest or perfect stage. So Rati is like the seed from which grows the tree of emotions. The first concern of a man is, therefore, to implant this seed in the mind if he wishes to grow in love. It is said that once germinated "love grows by co-operation," and that "conjugal love, concentrated as it is upon one object exclusively is more enduring and complete than any other. From personal experience of strong love, we rise by degrees to sincere affection for all mankind."[1] The necessity of a female companion is thus admitted for the first growth of love.

(g) For adopting the nature of women.

Newman says[2]—"If thy soul is to go on into higher spiritual blessedness, it must become a woman, yes, however, manly thou may be among men." Not only must a soul be a woman for loving the Great Lover, but there must be a woman to take his hands and conduct him along the path. To see Paradise each Dante must have his Beatrice to guide him. To love God with the intensity of female affection is also a very familiar idea with the Gauḍīya Vaīṣṇavas who believe, as we have noted before, that the life of Caitanya Deva was a practical illustration

[1] A General View of Positivism by A. Comte, pp. 251-52, 271.
[2] Dr. D. C. Sen's Caitanya and His Companions, p. 169.

of this principle. The Sahajiyās also believe that at a certain stage of spiritual culture the man should transform himself into a woman, and remember that he cannot have experience of true love so long as he cannot realise the true nature of a woman in him.[1] This assumption of the nature of a woman is rendered easy by being associated with a woman in spiritual culture, for unless you know the woman you cannot adopt her nature. "The thing of the idea, and the idea of the thing are not identical. It is only when the knowledge of object is already formed that one can begin to think about the knowledge itself."[2] But what is meant by a man becoming a woman? Consider the state of an old man of 80. He is a male being, no doubt, but all his passions have suffered natural extinction, and the male elements in him are conspicuous by their absence. This state of things in the grandfather is the effect of age and decay, but consider the case of a youngman acquiring that state of neutrality by careful spiritual exercises. In him his senses will then remain vigorous

[1] পুরুষ ছাড়িয়া প্রকৃতি হবে।
এক দেহ হয়ে নিত্যতে যাবে ॥

Caṇḍīdāsa's Pada (P. E.), Song No. 773.

স্বভাব প্রকৃতি হৈলে তবে রাগ রতি।

Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 2.

প্রকৃতি আচার পুরুষ বেভার
যে জনা জানিতে পারে।

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 22.

আপনি পুরুষ প্রকৃতি হইবে।

Rasasāra, p. 47.

[2] Normal and Abnormal Psychology by Boris Sidis, pp. 32 and 113.

and sound, entirely free from the decaying influence of old age, but controlled to such an extent that they would produce no reaction due to external stimuli. We know of one typical case of this nature illustrated in the legend of Arjuna. Ūrvaśī, the most beautiful dancing girl of heaven, one night went to meet him but was refused. Thereupon she cursed him to become a eunuch, in which condition he passed one year in the harem of the king of Virāṭa. To remain firm in the midst of temptation is surely a great achievement for any man, and a necessary condition for spiritual advancement. It must also be understood that this state of thing cannot be acquired without much exertion. The Sahajiyās advocate the company of women for this purpose, for we have seen, as we have stated above, that Kāma can be duly subdued by culture in the company of women. But there are some finer sentiments which are the natural inheritance of women. "In all kinds of force, whether physical, intellectual, or practical it is certain that man surpasses woman, but in the highest attributes of Humanity women are their superiors."[1] It is for the acquisition of this perfection that women are taken, for it becomes easy for a critical observer while in the company of women to measure their depth of feelings and to adopt them in a practical way. The necessity of female companion is thus established on this standpoint also.

In this connection we refer to the following opinion of A. Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe, late Judge of the High Court of Calcutta):—"In his manifestation as Rādhā He (Viṣṇu) is both the fount of emotion (Rasa) and emotion itself which includes the sexual sensation

[1] A General View of Positivism by A. Comte, p. 225.

(Śṛṅgāra), and the higher love (Madhura), which, in the more spiritually evolved marriage, is associated with it. The worshipper rises above the unconscious animal life, and the evil consciousness so often accompanying this upward movement in which the passions are regarded as things only of and for the limited self. The gratification of sense in serving self alone is a 'sowing to the flesh.' He, therefore, identifies himself with Rādhā, and thus places himself under the direction of Her Lord with whom She is one, and who as the Antaryāmin or indwelling spirit guides and controls the body and its senses. Thus gross desire is purified by its direction towards that abode of Viṣṇu wherein He as Gopāla plays and becomes as it were the vehicle on which subtle aspiration is made to rest.—This is exampled by the Sakhibhāva of the Vaiṣṇava, and certain ritual details in the Rahasyapūjā of the Śāktas."[1] and we may say by the Sahajiyās in particular.

(h) For the right knowledge about self.

It is said that "a man never knows himself until he sets up his body and mind for his own inspection and criticism."[2] The Sahajiyās also say that one's own body is the very best thing in this world, and that the knowledge of the nature of the body and the power to control it brings tranquillity in the mind, and that the human body is the basis of mystic culture.[3] Now, what is here considered important in this connection is the knowledge that everybody is made up of a male and a female half, *i. e.*, both the male and the female elements are present in every

[1] Tāntrik Texts, Vol. III, Intro., p. 63.

[2] The Origin and Nature of Man by S. B. McKinney, p. 21.

[3] সকলের সার হয় আপন শরীর ।
নিজ দেহ জানিলে আপনে হবে স্থির ॥
Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 3.

body.[1] Men and women are different externally, but so far as the soul is concerned there is absolutely no difference of any kind, in other words, "all body is but soul externised in matter."[2] The discrimination of sex is the root of Kāma, for so long as the conception of one's being a male and of another's being a female remains fixed in the mind, it is difficult to get rid of the influence which a female element naturally exercises over a male element, and consequently the mind is bound to be disturbed from its state of equilibrium favourable for the growth of spirituality. So, a devotee must know that in the spiritual field the mind should be so trained that it may not fall into the error of sex discrimination. Towards this great attainment, human nature will not easily find a better associate and helper than woman. Association with woman is thus justified for the realisation of this great truth.

The Parakīyās better than the Svakīyās.

These are some of the reasons, either principal or subsidiary, that are advanced in support of the custom of taking female companions in spiritual culture. Women are adopted primarily for the culture of Madhura Rasa or love. Now, just as a woman can have as her lover either

ভজনের মূল এই নরবপু দেহ ।
আপনা জানিলে তবে সহজ বস্তু জানে ।
Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 4.

1 সকল শরীরে হয় অর্দ্ধাঙ্গ অবলা ।
পুরুষ প্রকৃতি দুই দেহ মধ্যে আছে ॥
Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 4.

2 একরূপ দুই হয়, ভিন্ন দেহ নয় ।
প্রকৃতি পুরুষ নাম বাহিরে দেখয় ॥
Premānandalaharī, p. 8.

her own husband, or another with whom she has not been lawfully married, so Madhura Rasa adopted in divine worship assumes the characteristics of Svakīyā and Parakīyā.[1] Of these again Svakīyā, as we have noted before, is advocated for continuation and preservation of society, but in the domain of spiritual culture Parakīyā is held to be the better of the two.[2] Whenever the Sahajiyās speak of association with a woman, they invariably mean a Parakīyā companion. And why? The reasons advanced are many, some of which are noted below :—

Parakīyās are more attractive.

1. The human nature is so constituted that "every one who feels desire, desires that which lies not ready for his enjoyment, that which is not present with him,—such things only being the objects of love, and of desire" (Selections from Plato, p 73). Hence, the Parakīyā love, aiming at the enjoyment of what has not been tasted before, is found more covetable than the Svakīyā love which has lost much of its charm by being enjoyed. Besides, the risks and difficulties of the Parakīyā serve to intensify the impulse of love, and make it more enjoyable.[3] In the

[1] অতএব মধুর রস কহি তার নাম।
স্বকীয়া পরকীয়া ভাবে দ্বিবিধ সংস্থান॥
Cait. Carit., 1-4.

[2] পরকীয়া ধন সকল প্রধান
যতন করিয়া লই।
Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī, Song No. 795.

পরকীয়া রতি করহ আরতি
সেই সে ভজন সার।
Ibid, No. 771.

লোক শাস্ত্রে করে যাহা অনেক বারণ।
প্রচ্ছন্ন কামুক যাতে, দুর্লভ মিলন॥

sphere of the culture of love, therefore, the Parakīyās are considered better than the Svakīyās.

Parakīyā love is the basis of the Svakīyā love.

2. What is called Purva-Rāga or the dawn of love, is really the outcome of the desire for a Parakīyā union. In the works of poetics, the Parakīyās are classified under two heads—(*i*) the married wives of other persons, and (*ii*) the unmarried girls under the care of their lawful guardians. It is with the women of the latter class that courtship is allowed in society; and when the love-affairs end in wedlock, it gives the stamp of Svakīyā on those who were Parakīyās before. Parakīyā love is, therefore, the basis of the Svakīyā love.

In the Parakīyā there is unusual intensity of love.

3. Parakīyā love is considered interesting and deep, while the Svakīyā is shallow, and merely a semblance of love.[1] The latter is supported by custom and usages, as well as by the authority of the Śāstras, so in it there is a sort of compulsory constancy. Married wives may remain faithful to their husbands for fear of the censure of the people, or in obedience to the dictates of the Śāstras, or in consideration of earning merit as coun-

তাহাতে পরমা রতি মন্মথের হয়।
মহামুনি নিজ শাস্ত্রে এই মত কয়॥

Ujjvala-Candrikā, p. 5.

1 পরকীয়া রাগ অতি রসের উল্লাস।
স্বকীয়াতে রাগ নাই, কহিল আভাস॥

Rasaratnasāra, p. 65.

পরকীয়া রসে হয় রসের উল্লাস।
স্বকীয়া যে স্বল্প, তাহা জানিহ নির্য্যাস॥

Sudhāmṛtakaṇikā, p. 8.

tenanced by religion;[1] and it may also usually happen that their constancy may never be put to test under adverse circumstances. But the intensity of love is measured by the amount of sacrifice that one makes for it. Now, consider the case of a Parakīyā woman. The censure of the people, the fear of sin, and the allurement of earning merits (either in this world or the next) as laid down in the religious codes, cannot dissuade her from following the idol of her love with steadfast devotion![2] Such is the characteristic of intense love that it knows no bound. Dr. Tagore says—"When love becomes unbounded, it carries away all oppositions before it. The sense of shame, or the fear of public denunciation, can have no force to check its course. To the lover, his love, then, becomes all in all in the whole universe."[3] This is as much true of divine love, as of common love existing between man and woman. As, in the field of spirituality, we are chiefly concerned only with the intensity of love, Parakīyā is considered better than Svakīyā for the purpose of mystic culture.

1 স্বকীয়ার ধর্ম্ম যেই শুন তাহা কহি।
লোক বেদ ধর্ম্ম ভয় পতিগতি এহি॥
Rasasāra, p. 19.

2 লোক বেদ ধর্ম্ম পুণ্য যে নাহি মানয়।
মন নিষ্ঠে অন্য কান্তে করয়ে প্রণয়॥
পরকীয়া যে নর, আচার হয় এই।
এই সব গুণ যাতে পরকীয়া সেই॥
Ibid, p. 19.

3 শক্তি যারে দাও বহিতে অসীম প্রেমের ভার।
একেবারে সকল পর্দ্দা ঘুচায়ে দাও তার॥
না থাকে তার মান অপমান লজ্জা সরম ভয়।
একলা তুমি সমস্ত তার বিশ্বভুবনময়॥
Gītāñjali, Song No. 67

Parakīyā gives better enjoyment.

4. There is little novelty in the Svakīyā love, and consequently it soon becomes stale. It is for this reason that the problem of maintaining the warmth of married love has become so very intricate in all civilised societies. The Sahajiyās say that the lover should not live in the company of one he loves, for constant association wears away the cement of love. The Parakīyās, living apart, add fuel to the fervour of love, while the Svakīyās, being possessed without reserve, soon lose their fascination.[1] In 1176 A.D., the question was brought before a Court of Love by a Baron and a Lady of Champagne whether love is compatible with marriage. "No," said the Baron, "I admire and respect the sweet intimacy of married couples, but I cannot call it love. Love desires obstacles, mystery and stolen favours. Now, husbands and wives boldly avow their relationship, they possess each other without contradiction and without reserve. It cannot then be love that they experience."[2] As an illustration of this tendency of human mind, the author of the Ratnasāra has quoted a nice little story, which is also found narrated in the Karṇānanda of Yadunandana Dāsa,[3] and in the Vivarta-

[1] প্রণয় করহ তাথে সঙ্গে না রাখিবে।
এই মোর মিনতি প্রণতি যে শুনিবে ॥
সঙ্গেতে রাখিলে হবে অনুরাগহীন।
পরকীয়া বহুদূরে, স্বকীয়া অধীন ॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 155.

[2] The Psychology of Sex, by H. Ellis, Vol. VI, pp. 516-517.

[3] শুন পূর্ব্বে দেখ হুঁহে কৌমারের কালে।
বেতসীর বনে লীলা কৈল কুতূহলে ॥

Vilāsa (p. 156).[1] This shows that the idea was a favourite one with the Vaiṣṇavas of that time. The story runs thus:—The daughter of a king fell in love with a young man, the son of another king. They used to meet secretly within a grove by the side of a river flowing through a dense forest. The couple found their enjoyment full and perfect. But the young man was detected and caught by the men of the girl's father, who, on hearing about the love-affairs, got them married. It was on the occasion of the "Flower-bed" ceremony (when the lovers were together and alone for the first time after their marriage) that the king's palace was lighted with all brilliance, and every preparation was made for the enjoyment of the bride and

দৈব সংযোগে দুঁহার বিবাহ হইল।
বিবাহ হইতে সেই সুখ না জন্মিল॥

(M. E.), p. 79.

[1] The source of the story seems to be a Sanskrit verse quoted in the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta (Canto II, Chap. I), Kāvya-Prakāśa (1-4), Sāhitya-Darpaṇa (1-10), and Padyāvali (386). It is this:—

যঃ কৌমারহরঃ স এব হি বরস্তা এব চৈত্রক্ষপা-
স্তে চোন্মীলিতমালতী-সুরভয়ঃ প্রৌঢ়াঃ কদম্বানিলাঃ।
সা চৈবাস্মি তথাপি তত্র সুরতব্যাপারলীলাবিধৌ
রেবারোধসি বেতসীতরুতলে চেতঃ সমুৎকণ্ঠতে॥

Another verse of a similar sentiment from the Padyāvali (387) is found quoted in the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta with the remarks that Caitanya used to recite it when dancing with emotion. It is as follows:—

প্রিয়ঃ সোঽয়ং কৃষ্ণঃ সহচরি কুরুক্ষেত্রমিলিত-
স্তথাহং সা রাধা তদিদমুভয়োঃ সঙ্গমসুখম্।
তথাপ্যন্তঃখেলন্মধুরমুরলীপঞ্চমজুষে
মনো মে কালিন্দীপুলিনবিপিনায় স্পৃহয়তি॥

the bridegroom. But lying on the ivory couch, surrounded by luxuries of all descriptions, the couple found their enjoyment less charming than what they had experienced in the forest grove. This was due to the transfer of a Parakīyā to a Svakīyā. It is perhaps for the intoxicating enjoyment of this kind that so many people run after Parakīyās even at the sacrifice of honour and fame, thereby proclaiming the charming superiority of the Parakīyā over the Svakīyā love.

Parakīyā can lead to the most perfect stage of emotion.

5. Of the five Rasas, Śānta, Dāsya, Sakhya, Vātsalya and Madhura, it is said that "Śānta can lead up to Prema, Dāsya up to Rāga, Sakhya and Vātsalya up to Anurāga, but the Madhura up to Mahābhāva which is the most perfect stage of love. Now, Madhura possesses the characteristics of Rūḍha and Adhirūḍha, of which the former belongs to the Svakīyā wives of Kṛṣṇa, while the latter to the Gopīs who are Parakīyās. This Adhirūḍha is called Mahābhāva which has its full manifestation in the love of Rādhā.[1] So, the Parakīyā love manifested in the Gopīs can lead to the highest and the most perfect stage

1 শান্তরসে শান্তিরতি প্রেম পর্য্যন্ত হয়।
দাস্যরতি রাগ পর্য্যন্ত ক্রমেত বাঢ়য় ॥
সখ্য বাৎসল্য পায় অনুরাগ সীমা।
* * * *
রূঢ় অধিরূঢ় ভাব কেবল মধুরে।
মহিষীগণের রূঢ়, অধিরূঢ় গোপিকা নিকরে ॥
অধিরূঢ় মহাভাব—দুই ত প্রকার। etc.

Cait.-Carit., Canto II, Chap. 23.

মহাভাব স্বরূপা রাধা ঠাকুরাণী।

Ibid, Canto I, Chap. 4.

of emotion which the Svakīyā love of the wedded wives of Kṛṣṇa cannot attain.

Another argument in this connection is based upon the conception of the three kinds of Rati, namely, Sādhāraṇī, Samañjasā, and Samarthā. The Rati that is obtainable without much exertion is called Sādhāraṇī, which is found illustrated in the case of Kuvjā, a common woman who had been associated with Kṛṣṇa for a short period only. The queens of Kṛṣṇa are examples of the Samañjasā Rati which is present in wedded love only; while the Gopīs are the Samarthās. Now, this Samarthā is the very root of the emotions like Rati, Sneha, Prema, Māna, Praṇaya, etc., about which we have spoken before, the gradual development of which leads to Mahābhāva. So, from the Samarthā Rati one can attain to the highest perfection of emotions, but from the Samañjasā one cannot go beyond Anurāga, while the Sādhāraṇī leads up to Prema only.[1] Thus Parakiyā symbolised in the love of the Gopīs is superior to Samañjasā represented by the Svakīyā wives of Kṛṣṇa.

[1] অনায়াসে যেমতি মিলে বহু চেষ্টা বিনে।
সাধারণী রতি ইহা শুনহ যতনে॥
*   *   *   *
কুব্জাতে সাধারণী প্রেম পর্য্যন্ত হয়।
*   *   *   *
পট্টমহিষী সমঞ্জসা রতি হয়।
অনুরাগ পর্য্যন্ত এই জানিহ নিশ্চয়॥
আর ব্রজ সুন্দরী সুবলাদি সখা।
সমর্থা রতি হয় এ সবার লেখা॥
সেইত সমর্থা রতি যে যে গুণ ধরে।
ব্যক্ত করি কহি তাহা শুনহ সাদরে॥

6. The chance of Viraha or separation is usually not so great in the Svakīyā love as it is in the Parakīyā amours. As there is generally no uncertainty as to the ultimate union with the Svakīyā mate, the Viraha is less keenly felt in the married love than in the Parakīyā, wherein one has to depend on chance only even for the secret meetings.[1] This makes Svakīyā less interesting than Parakīyā. Now, Viraha supplies the force that is necessary for the continuous flow of the current of love, and it is as useful in love-affairs as the intermediate depression for the production of two consecutive upheavals of a wavy surface. The Vivarta-Vilāsa has explained the necessity of Viraha with an illustration from the Bhāgavata. On the occasion of the Rāsa festival when the Gopīs assembled in the forest to meet Kṛṣṇa, he asked them about the reason of their coming there, and when he became satisfied with their answers that they were full of love for him, he began the Rāsa festival. During the progress of the event when each Gopī, elated with joy at the attention that she was receiving from him, began to claim him as her own

Viraha makes Parakīyā more interesting than the Svakīyā.

রতি স্নেহ প্রেম এই তিনটী প্রকার।

*　　*　　*　　*

তদুপরি মহাভাব সিতোৎপলাবৎ।

সমর্থা রতির এই কহিনু তাবৎ॥

Rasasāra, pp. 28-34.

N. B.—Anurāga and Prema are considered less intense than Mahābhāva.

[1] কভু মিলে, কভু না মিলে, দৈবের ঘটন।

Cait.-Carit., Canto II, Chap. 4.

lover, a kind of Svakīyā sentiment crept in, with the loss of the intensity of love. Thereupon, Kṛṣṇa disappeared, followed by the wailings of the maids. When this separation rekindled their flame of love to its former intensity, Kṛṣṇa reappeared before them and was received with intense fervour.[1] In fact Viraha makes love charming and keeps up an even flow. As in the Parakīyā love it is more in evidence than in the Svakīyā, the former is considered more in the spirit of the highest love than the latter.

Parakīyā does not allow excessive sensuality.

7. Taking into consideration the inclinations and tendencies of a large section of the human beings in sexual life, Parakīyā, as argued by the Sahajiyās, is better than the Svakīyā. They say—"The Svakīyās present opportunities of going to excesses, whereas the Parakīyās, by imposing checks and limitations, do not allow unrestricted sensuality. Because the Svakīyā is

[1] কৃষ্ণ আকর্ষণ করি গোপীগণে আনি।
বনে আইলা কেনে, কৃষ্ণ কহে নিষ্ঠুর বাণী॥
পূর্ণ অনুরাগ যবে হইল সবাকারে।
আরম্ভিল রাস সবে আনন্দ পাথারে॥
পুনঃ রাসে অন্তর্ধান কৃষ্ণ হইলা কেনে।
গোপীসবার মনে কৃষ্ণ মোর হইল জ্ঞানে॥
আমার হইলে, পরভাব নাহি রয়।
এই লাগি অন্তর্ধান কৈলা মহাশয়॥
পুনঃ অনুরাগ হইলে কৃষ্ণ দেখা দিলা।
অনুরাগ পরক্রিয়া লাগি এত লীলা॥

pp. 155-56.

N. B.—The incident is narrated in the Bhāgavata, Canto 10, Chaps. 29-33.

authorised by the Śāstras and social custom, there is none to question its legality—no matter how much a man may misuse the opportunities of indulging in legalised Kāma (sensuality).[1] But the Parakīyā is beset with checks of various kinds, and consequently its scope of going to excess is very limited. Moreover, when in the spiritual culture Parakīyā woman is adopted for the training of Kāma, and the cultivation of Love, man cannot go beyond a certain limit according to the prescribed rules to be followed in practising that method of culture.[2] So, judging by the standard of actual indulgences due to the natural weakness of man, Parakīyā is better suited for spiritual culture than the Svakīyā.

These are some of the reasons that are advanced by the Sahajiyās in justification of their practice of taking Parakīyā companions for the culture of Love. In fact the doctrine they follow is mainly based on the principle that the female associates should invariably be of the Parakīyā character. They have taken into consideration the natural weakness of man, and in their eagerness to work on the principle that "the study of mankind is man" they have ignored the injunctions of the Śāstras and the society, and have thus got clear of the fetters of

[1] স্বকীয়া রমণী করি সংসারিয়া জনে।
কামে উন্মত্তা করে ইন্দ্রিয় পোসনে ॥
নিজ দেহ প্রীত করি শৃঙ্গার করয়।
স্বকীয়া বেদের উক্তি নাহি তাহে ভয় ॥

Ratnasāra, p. 6.

স্বকীয়া অনুবাদ করি বেদের কারণ।
বিচ্ছেদের ভয় নাই, স্বসুখ সাধন ॥

Ibid, p. 7.

[2] For details, see below.

convention. The orthodox view is, no doubt, against the adoption of the Parakīyā ideal, but before uttering a word of denunciation, one must sink deep to get to the bottom of the principle on which the erotio-psychological culture of the Sahajiyās is based.

Parakīyā classified.

We have stated before that in the works of poetics Parakīyā is said to be of two kinds—(*i*) Kanyakā, when one courts the love of any unmarried girl under the care of her legal guardian, and (*ii*) Paroḍhā, when one is engaged in love affairs with the married wife of another person. The former is tolerated when the ultimate object is union in marriage, but the latter is denounced by the Śāstras and the society alike. But such classification of Parakīyā based on social convention is of little importance in the spiritual field, so the Sahajiyās are scrupulously silent about the differentiation of this kind. Ignoring the distinction between Kanyakā and Paroḍhā, they go so far as to declare that Parakīyā as treated in the Śastras and the society, is practically of one kind,[1] and then they go on classifying it from the point of view of their own spiritual dogmas.

The Parakīyā, it is said, is of two kinds—(*i*) Gauṇa, (*ii*) Mukhya.[1] When one is associated with a Parakīyā

[1] পরকীয়া এক নহে দুই মত বটে।
শাস্ত্র লোকাদিতে সবে এক মত বটে ॥
গৌণ মুখ্য দুই মত হয় পরকীয়া।
মুখ্য রাধিকার প্রেম নয়নে দেখিয়া ॥
গৌণেতে প্রাকৃত রতি রসিকের প্রাণ।
তাহাতেই রসিক শেখর অধিষ্ঠান ॥

Sudhāmṛtakaṇikā, p. 15.

woman for the culture of love, it is Gauṇa, but when without taking a woman of flesh and blood in this way, the ideal of Parakīyā love (of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa) is theoretically adopted for spiritual advancement, it becomes Mukhya. In the Vivarta-Vilāsa, the former is called Bāhya, while the latter as Marma Parakīyā.[1] In the Ratiyilāsa-Paddhati they are called Aprākṛta and Prākṛta respectively. As the visible body is unreal, so the Parakīyā of the body is called Aprākṛta. It is simply the outer form of culture.[2] But the Parakīyā of the mind which lies wholly in the sphere of emotion, is called Prākṛta Parakīyā.

In another work these two terms have been used with opposite signification. The Rati cultured in the material or visible body is there called Prākṛta, which is further designated by the term Sāmānyā,[3] while the other practised in the mind is called Aprākṛta. Inspite of such terminological differentiation, it is, however, quite clear that only two kinds of Parakīyā are meant, one of which is the Parakīyā of the body, while the other is the Parakīyā of the mind. The former, as we have seen, is designated by the terms Gauṇa, Bāhya, Prākṛta

1 বাহ্য মর্ম্ম দুই পরকীয়াতে সাধন ॥
বাহ্য পরকীয়া কর নায়িকার সঙ্গে।
অন্তরঙ্গ পরকীয়া বাণের তরঙ্গে ॥
(B. E.), p. 97.

2 অপ্রাকৃত পরকীয়া, আর দেহ অপ্রাকৃত।
বহিরঙ্গ প্রবৃত্তি এই সাধন কথিত ॥
pp. 28-29.

3 প্রাকৃত রতি পরকীয়া সামান্যা কহি তারে।
Ratnasāra, p. 10.

or Aprākṛta, Sāmānyā, etc., while the latter by Mukhya, Marma, Antaraṅga, Aprākṛta or Prākṛta, etc.

It should be observed that the idea of the external or physical, and internal or mental form of culture is also entertained by the Vaiṣṇavas. The Caitanya-Caritāmṛta says—" The culture of love is of two kinds—(*i*) Bāhya, and (*ii*) Antara.[1] The Sahajiyā works like the Amṛtarasāvalī and the Sahaja-Tattva-Grantha speak of the same two main divisions also.[2] We shall now deal with these two aspects of culture one after another.

Bāhya Culture.

In mystic culture the selection of a female companion is of primary importance. Any and every woman cannot be adopted for this purpose, but Parakīyās of a particular description and excellence are considered suitable for spiritual culture. About the adoptable woman, the Nāyikā-Sādhana-Ṭīkā says—" She shall have a husband at home, and be a woman of exquisite beauty. She shall possess an equal share of the excellence of the body and of the mind, and in perfection be an ideal woman. Her sudden appearance will open the door of emotion, and her beauty passing through the eyes will touch the

The selection of women.

[1] "বাহ্য" "অন্তর" ইহার দুইত সাধন।

Canto II, Chap. 22.

[2] বাহ্যের সাধন|মনের করণ

সহজ বস্তু যেই শিখাইল।

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 2.

বাহ্য অন্তর দুই মত জাজন।

Sahaja-Tattva Grantha, p. 4.

heart and captivate the mind. One should perform spiritual culture in the company of such a woman."[1] The Rasa-Tattva-Sāra says that the woman should have her eyes like lotuses, and beauty like that of a Campaka flower, and she will know no third person.[2] In the Vivarta-Vilāsa it is said that the women of this type should be very beautiful, and that both in character and physical grace they should be quite heavenly.[3]

The Ratīvilāsa-Paddhati says that a Samarthā woman may forsake her husband, but she should be devoted to her lover, whom she would never discard for a third. She shall have her Rati (passion) perfectly controlled, so that she may never fall a prey to weakness. Such

[1] গৃহে পতি থাকিবেক, পরম সুন্দরী।
রূপে গুণে সমান যে, অদ্ভুত সে নারী॥
ভাবদ্বারে হঠাৎকারে আসিয়া মিলিবে।
নয়নে লাগিয়া রূপ হৃদয়ে পশিবে॥
হৃদয়ে পশিয়া মন করে আকর্ষণ।
তদুপরি করিবেক তাহার সাধন॥

p. 1.

[2] অপূর্ব্ব নায়িকার হয় স্বরূপ বিলক্ষণ।
পদ্মনেত্র হবে তার চম্পক বরণ॥
তৃতীয় পুরুষ সঙ্গ কভু না জানিব।
তিন পুরুষ সঙ্গ হইলে বেশ্যা কহিব॥
এমতি লক্ষণ যদি নায়িকা মিলিব।
সর্ব্ব ধর্ম্ম ত্যাগ করি শরণ লইব॥

p. 9.

[3] এসব নায়িকাগণ পরম সুন্দরী।
আকার স্বভাবে যেন ব্রহ্মদেবী নারী॥

p. 99.

a woman is like a lioness in strength.[1] In the Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, we have the following description of an adoptable woman—"The woman suitable for the Sahajiyā culture should be in her full youth and her side-long looks piercing like arrows. Her features should be expressive of all good signs, and she should wear dresses rich in colours. Her lips should hold, as it were, a store of nectar, and her body resemble a creeper in delicacy with colour like that of gold, and soothing to touch. A woman of such description is the best medium of mystic culture.[2]

The Sudhāmṛtakaṇikā says that the female companion should be like Rādhā in beauty, and her grace should be

[1] ধর্ম্মত্যাগ করে উপপতির নিষ্ঠতা।
তৃতীয় পুরুষ ভোগে না হয় সমর্থা॥
*   *   *   *
সমর্থা সেই, রতি বিভঙ্গ নাই যার।
*   *   *   *
রতি নিষ্ঠা নায়িকা সিংহতুল্যা গণি॥

pp. 11-13.

[2] সহজের পাত্র হয় নবীন কিশোরী।
নয়ান কটাক্ষবাণে করিল জর্জ্জরি॥
সুলক্ষণ সকল থাকিব যাহার।
চিত্র বিচিত্র অঙ্গ বেশভূষা আর॥
অমৃত অধরে যার, সেই সুধামুখী।
কনক লতিকা দেহের তুলনা না দেখি॥
হেমলতা, স্নিগ্ধাঙ্গী, কাঞ্চন বরণী।
অলকা তিলকা হবে দেহের সাজনী॥
এমত নায়িকা হৈলে সহজ নায়িকা।
তাহার সেবন শ্রেষ্ঠ জানিহ অধিকা॥

p. 16.

of the following description—"She walks with deep measured steps like an elephant, and wears a cloth of the colour of the cloud. Her foot-ornaments emit jingling sounds as she moves on. The nose-ring oscillating flashes like the lightning and her teeth are like the seeds of pomegranate. She yawns often, and walking as if in intoxication, she sinks in idleness. Her waist is like that of a lioness, with a beautiful chain girdling it, and her two thighs resemble the best plantain plant."[1]

The typical description of an adoptable woman is also found in the Bṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā, thus—"The woman who does not know a second husband, if adopted, will not lead to spiritual success. She should have wonderful beauty, with eyes like lotuses, and colour

[1] কিশোরী স্বরূপ রূপ যেখানে দেখিব।
সেরূপ নায়িকা অঙ্গ নয়নে রাখিব॥

p. 18.

Also—

গজ রাজ জিনি মধুর চলনী
মেঘাম্বর পরিধান।
চলিতে নূপুর বাজে রুনু ঝুনু
চমকী রাখয়ে তান॥
নাসার বেসর চলিতে হেলিছে
বিজুলী খেলায় তায়।
দাড়িম্ব বীজ জিনি দন্তের ছাদনী
ঘন ঘন তোলে হাই॥
মদভরে রাই চলিতে চলিতে
আলসে ডুবিয়ে যায়।

pp. 10-11.

like that of a Campaka flower. Her thighs will excel in smoothness and formation the plantain tree, and she shall have her breasts better than two *Bael* fruits in shape, teeth more beautiful than the seeds of pomegranates, eyes like those of the deer, waist more slender than that of the lion, and so forth."[1]

These are particulars about the beauty of the women who can be taken as partners in mystic culture. The idea is that only those of the fair sex who are most beautiful in limbs and body can best serve the purpose of generating the emotion of love in man, and provision has, therefore, been made for the selection of such of them who possess an extraordinary share of this personal grace. If the man is to be tested in the fire of passion, he must be placed in an atmosphere where the allurement is unusually strong; and if he can then remain firm in the midst of such temptation, he is really sound

[1] দ্বিতীয় পুরুষ সঙ্গ কভু নাই করে।
তাহার আশ্রীত হৈলে, প্রাপ্তি ফল নাহি ধরে॥
অপূর্ব্ব নায়িকা যে স্বরূপ বিলক্ষণ।
পদ্মনেত্র হয় আর চম্পক বরণ॥
এমতি লক্ষণ যদি নায়িকা পাইবে।
তবেত সাধন সিদ্ধি নিশ্চয় হইবে॥

p. 54.

Also—

প্রকৃতির লক্ষণ।—উরু জিনি রম্ভা শ্রীফল জিনি কুচদ্বয়, বিম্ব জিনি ওষ্ঠ, দাড়িম্ব জিনি দশন, কপিলা জিনি কেশ, মৃগ জিনি নয়ান, সিংহ জিনি মাজা, হস্তী জিনি গমন, চম্পক জিনি বরণ, পদ্ম জিনি গন্ধ, তিল ফুল জিনি নাসা, গিধিনী জিনি কর্ণ, ভুরু জিনি বকফুল-কলি, কোকিল জিনি স্বর, ইত্যাদি।

p. 55.

in the possession of moral strength. An illustration of a man of such attainment is found in the person of Rāmānanda Ray, who was a contemporary of Caitanya. The Caitanya-Caritāmṛta says that he was for some time associated with two youthful girls, who were extremely beautiful, and very expert in dancing and singing. He used to rub their bodies all over with his own hands, to assist them in bathing, and to clothe them after bath, without being moved in the least.[1] In order to test the soundness of a man by placing him in the midst of such alluring circumstances, the Sahajiyās advocate the company of women who may be regarded as typically beautiful in every respect

Other considerations.

There are other considerations which should also guide a man in the matter of selection and culture. In mystic culture both the man and the woman should be of identical spiritual temperament.[2] In one of the Rāgātmikā *Padas* attributed to Caṇḍīdāsa, it is said that in the culture of the Rati the man and the woman should be of the same nature. A man of the lion-class (the best among men) should take

The man and the woman should be of the same nature.

[1] দুই দেবকন্যা হয় পরমা সুন্দরী।
নৃত্যগীতে নিপুণ সেই, বয়সে কিশোরী॥
স্বহস্তে করান তার অভ্যঙ্গ মর্দ্দন।
স্বহস্তে করান স্নান, গাত্র সম্মার্জ্জন॥
স্বহস্তে পরান বস্ত্র, সর্ব্বাঙ্গ মণ্ডন।
তত্তু নির্ব্বিকার রায় রামানন্দের মন॥

Canto II, Chap. 5.

উভয়ে সমান হৈলে তবে ইহা মিলে।
সাধারণী হৈলে ইথে যায় রসাতলে॥

Premavilāsa (*vide* B. T. S., p. 1666).

up a woman of the Padminī class (the best among women), and then the culture will produce favourable result, like gold melting in the presence of borax. If the woman be associated with a man of vicious tendency, she will be torn like a flower in the midst of thorns. In the same way, a man taking a woman of mean nature, wanders about like one under the influence of ghost.[1]

In another *Pada* the poet says—"Love should be made with those who may be termed good in the matter of love. And why? Because the love of such a man is permanent like the impression on stone and knows

[1] পুরুষ প্রকৃতি দোঁহে এক রীতি
সে রতি সাধিতে হয়।
* * * * *
পুরুষ-সিংহেতে পদ্মিণী নারীতে
যে সাধন উপজয়।
স্বজাতি অনুগা সোনাতে সোহাগা
পাইলে গলিয়া যায়॥
যে জাতি যুবতী সাধিতে সে রতি
কুজাতি পুরুষে ধরে।
কণ্টকে যেমন পুষ্প হয় ক্ষত
হৃদয় ফাটিয়া মরে॥
পুরুষ তেমতি নারী হীন জাতি
রতির আশ্রয় লয়।
ভূতে ধরে তারে মরে ঘুরে ফিরে
দ্বিজ চণ্ডীদাস কয়॥

(P. E., Song No. 811).

no decay. It rather gains in flavour when enjoyed." [1] It is also said that a man should understand his own nature, and then practise the cult of love with a woman of good tendency.[2]

They must be of one mind.

Not only the man and the woman should be of the same nature, but they must be of one mind, and take to spiritual culture with perfect unanimity of purpose.[3] In one of the Rāgātmikā *Padas* it is said that in the sphere of spiritual culture the woman should be like a reservoir of Rasa (or love), her soul resembling that of Rādhā. The man should take her as his Guru (preceptor), and serve her like a servant taking refuge in her, and the

[1] শুন গো সজনি আমার বাত ।
পীরিতি করবি সুজন সাত ॥
সুজন পীরিতি পরাণ (পাষাণ) রেখ ।
পরিনামে কভু না হবে টোট ॥
ঘষিতে ঘষিতে চন্দন সার ।
দ্বিগুণ সৌরভ উঠয়ে তার ॥
(P. E.), Song No. 784.

[2] আপনা বুঝিয়া সুজন দেখিয়া
পীরিতি করিব তায় ॥
Ibid, S. No. 783.

[3] *দোঁহে এক হয়ে ডুবে সিদ্ধ হয় তবে ॥
দোঁহার মন ঐক্যভাবে ডুবি এক হয় ।
তবেত সহজসিদ্ধ জানিহ নিশ্চয় ॥
Premānandalaharī, p. 8.

woman should also adopt the man in the same way.[1] The Svarūpakalpataru says that the man should submit himself in every respect to the woman, and he should never think of his own happiness, being fully absorbed in love. Then the couple should have the spiritual realisation of the Supreme Being in their mind.[2]

Let us now take up the subject of practical culture in the company of a woman of flesh and blood. The subjoined account is from an authoritative Sahajiyā text.

The particulars of Mystic culture in the company of a woman, as narrated in the Nāyīkā-sādhana-Tīkā (University Manuscript No. 3906).

Particulars of mystic culture.

At the commencement of the mystic practices, a seat should be placed for the Nāyikā (woman). It should be $2\frac{3}{4}$ cubits square, on which the Nāyikā should be seated. Then her feet should be washed with due care, and she should be served with sandal-paste by the man uttering the formula "*Etat Candana śrī śrī rasamayī ca nama nama.*" Then will begin the ceremony consisting of 8 parts, such as,

[1] সে দেশের রজকিণী হয় রসের অধিকারী
রাধিকা স্বরূপ তার প্রাণ।
তুমিত রমণের গুরু সেহ রসের কল্পতরু
তার সনে দাস অভিমান॥

(P. E.), Song No. 768.

[2] নায়েক যগুপি হয় নায়িকার বশ।
আত্মসুখ নাহি জানে রাগেতে অবশ॥
সেই নায়েক নায়িকা শতসিদ্ধ হয়।
সহজ মানুষ কৃষ্ণ তাহাতে আশ্রয়॥

p. 19.

(1) Sādhana, (2) Smaraṇa, (3) Āropa, (4) Manana, (5) Dhyāna, (6) Pūjā, (7) Jāpa, and (8) Ārādhanā.[1]

1. *Sādhana.*—The mystic formula *Ślīng premamayī rasavatī dehi māṃ śaraṇāgata* should be recounted 108 times in the following manner :—After it has been recited 25 times, a handful of flowers smeared or sprinkled with sandal-paste should be offered to the woman. This should be done 4 times thereby completing the recitation of the formula 100 times, so the fifth offering should be made after recounting it 8 times only.

2. *Smaraṇa.*—The mystic formula *Ślīng klīng rasa-prema nama nama* should be recited 109 times.

3. *Āropa.*—The mystic formula *He he ślīng rasamayī tava śaraṇāgata mamāsteva sahāya* should be recounted 25 times in the mind with closed eyes. Then the eyes should be opened, and after reciting the same formula

[1] অথ নাইকা সাধন লিখ্যতে। সাধন ১ স্বরণ ২ আরোপ ৩ মনন ৪ ধ্যান ৫ পূজা ৬ জাপ ৭ আরাধনা ৮॥ সাধন পূর্ব্বে নাইকানাং আসনং প্রমানং। এগার পোয়া আসন করিবেক। তদুপরি সেই রসমই নাইকা আসন পরি বসাইবে। পরে আবেস করিয়া চরণ প্রক্ষালন করিবেক। পরে চন্দন সেবা। এতৎ চন্দন শ্রীশ্রীরসমই চ নম নম। পরে পুষ্প চন্দন সহ অঞ্জলি। ইতি সাধন মন্ত্র। শ্লীং প্রেমময়ি রসবতী দেহি মাম্ শরনাগত। এই মন্ত্র ১০৮ বার পর্ব্ব জাপ করিবেক। পঞ্চবিংশতি পর্ব্ব জাপ করিবেক আর এক অঞ্জলি পুষ্প চন্দন সহ সংযোগ করিয়া সমর্পণ করিবেক। এই রূপ চারি অঞ্জলি পর অষ্ট পর্ব্ব এক অঞ্জলি। এই এক শত অষ্ট পর্ব্ব একুনে পঞ্চাঞ্জলি ইতি। পূর্ব্বপক্ষ সাধন অঙ্গ। পরে স্বরণ যুগল রস। ইতি যুগল মন্ত্র শ্লীং ক্লীং রস প্রেম নম নম। * পরে ঐ যুগল মন্ত্র স্মরণ, একশত নবম পর্ব্ব॥ পরে রসমই নাইকা। হে হে শ্লীং রসমই তব শরণাগত মমাস্তেব সহায়। *এই আরোপ পঞ্চ বিংশতি পর্ব্ব স্মরণ। অন্তরমনায় চক্ষু মুদিয়া এই আরোপ জাপ করিবে। পরে চক্ষু মেলিবেক। তদুপরি চক্ষু মেলিয়া পুনর্ব্বার ঐ মন্ত্র পঞ্চ পর্ব্ব করিয়া জাপ করিবেক, আর একাঞ্জলি পুষ্প চন্দন সহ সংযোগ (করিয়া) আপন নিবেদয়েৎ। ইতি নিবেদন। এতৎ চন্দনং পুষ্পং শ্রীশ্রীরসমই

5 times an offering of a handful of flowers smeared with sandal-paste should be made to the woman with the following *mantra*:—*Etat candanaṃ puṣpaṃ śrī śrī rasamaī nama nama.* This should be done 25 times.

4. *Manana.*—This means realisation in the mind of the beauty of the woman when she is out of sight. This is wholly in the sphere of emotion. The following mystic formula should be recounted in the mind:—*He he rasamaī, he rasanāgarī, he he rasavilāsinā vilāsinī, he sundarī rasa-ullāsinī, he he mama prāṇa-śiromaṇi, tava caraṇe śaraṇaṃ nama nama.* Then the Mantra *Hlīng ślīng klīng bhāva-ullāsa rasa-prema nama nama* should be recounted 103 times and the figure of the woman should be pictured in the mind.

5. *Dhyāna.* The Nāyaka should perform the Dhyāna (meditation) of the Nāyikā (woman) in the following manner:—The woman should be seated on his left side, and she should be kissed and touched, so that the mind

নম নম॥ এই নিবেদন মন্ত্র। এই মন্ত্রে পঞ্চবিংশতি অঞ্জলি অর্পেৎ। তদুপরি মনন। মনন, যখন নাইকা অদর্শন। তখন মননে নাইকার রূপ নিরীক্ষণ সর্ব্বদা ইতি। ইহাতে ভাবদ্বারে বর্ত্তমান। ভাবনাস্তব। হে হে রসমই হে রস নাগরী, হে হে রস বিলাসিনা বিলাসিণী, হে সুন্দরী রস উল্লাসিণী, হে হে মম প্রাণ-শিরোমণি, তব চরণে শরণং নম নম॥ এই স্তব স্মরণ করিবেক। আরোপ পরে জাপ মন্ত্র॥ শ্রীরূপ মঞ্জরি ও রাধাকৃষ্ণ এই তিনের মন্ত্র। হ্লীং শ্লীং ক্লীং ভাব উল্লাস রস প্রেম নম নম, এই মন্ত্র ১০৩ একশত তিন বার জাপ করিবেক। পরে ভাবদ্বারে সেই রসমইকে হৃদপদ্মে বসাইবে। পূজা ভাবনা ইতি॥ ৪॥ ধ্যান। নাইকার ধ্যান নাএক করিবেক যেমন। তাহার নির্ণয় এবে শুন সর্ব্বজন॥ নাইকা লইয়া বাম করে বসাইবে। মুখে চুম্ব দিয়া পর্ষ তখনি করিবে॥ তাহার পরশে হিয়া প্রফুল্লিত হবে। মনে মনে রস গাইত্রি স্মরণ করিবে। তথাহি রস গাইত্রী॥ শ্লীং রসমই তব চরণে শরণং মমাস্তে॥ এই মন্ত্র পঞ্চবিংশতি বার জপ করিবেক। পরে মুখে চুম্বন দিয়া রস পান করিবে। পরে রসবীজকে ভাবনা

may become inspired. Then the formula of Rasa-Gāyatrī, such as, *Śling rasamayī tava carane śaranam mamāste*, should be recited 25 times in the mind. She should then be kissed again. Afterwards, the formula called the Rasa-Bīja, such as, *Klīng rasarāja rasadānam dehi mamāste* should be recounted 8 times. Then the formula called the *Kandarpa Sādhana Mantra* (formula for the worship of cupid) such as, *Hlīng kandarpa koṭi matta-mātangī svāhā* should be recounted 130 times. Then the woman should worship *kandarpa*, first by uttering the formula,—*He he kandarpa, he prāṇanātha, he he rasarāja, he rasa-ullāsa, tava dāsī mamāste*, and then after recounting the formula *Klīng kandarpāya nama nama* 19 times, should make an offering to the Nāyaka (man). This should be done 5 times.

6. *Pūjā.*—This should be done by the Nāyaka. The things required are incense, sandal-paste, flowers, and a seat of $2\frac{3}{4}$ cubits. The seat should be worshipped at first. An offering of sandal-paste should be made after uttering the formula—*Etad candanam sthitam āsanam nama nama.* Similarly some flowers should be offered

করিবে। ইতি রস বীজ ক্লীং রসরাজ রসদানং দেহি মমাস্তে॥ এই মন্ত্র অষ্ট পর্ব্ব জাপ করিবে। পরে কন্দর্প সাধনা মন্ত্র ভাবনা ইতি॥ শ্লীং কন্দর্প কোটী মত্তমাতঙ্গী স্বাহায়॥ ইতি কন্দর্প আরাধনা এই মন্ত্র॥ ১৩০ একশত ত্রিশ বার এই মন্ত্র জাপ করিবেক। ইহাতে কন্দর্প আকর্ষণ হইবেক। পরে নাইকা কন্দর্প পূজা করিবেক। হে হে কন্দর্প হে প্রাণনাথ, হে হে রসরাজ হে রস উল্লাস তবদাসী মমাস্তে ইতি॥ এই স্তব আগে পাঠ করিবেক। পরে পূজা যথা মন্ত্র। ক্লীং কন্দর্পায় নম নম। এই মন্ত্র উনবিংশতি পর্ব্ব জপ করিবেক, আর এক অঞ্জলি নাএকে সমর্পণ। এই মত পঞ্চাঞ্জলি॥ তদুপরি নাইকা পূজা। নাএক করিবেক। ইহার সামগ্রী আয়জন। ধূপ চন্দন আর পুষ্প, এই সামগ্রী আগে আয়জন করিবেক। তদুপরি আসন এগার পোয়া করিবেক। তদুপরি আসন পূজা। এতৎ চন্দনং স্থিতং আসনং নম নম। চন্দনং। তদুপরি পুষ্প। এতৎ গন্ধপুষ্পং স্থিতং আসনং

with the formula—*Etad gandha-puṣpaṃ sthitaṃ āsanaṃ nama nama.* Then the woman should be seated on that seat, and she should be bathed in water by reciting the formula—*Etad jala-snānaṃ śrī śrī rasamayī nama nama.* Then will begin the real worship. The mystic formula *Plīng prema-rasamayī, ślīng rasa-sindhu vindahi, klīng rasavilāsine svāhāyāt* should be recounted 25 times in the mind. Then, after reciting the formula—*Etad gandha-puṣpaṃ tava caraṇe nama nama,* three times, an offering of flowers should be made, and the man should bow down his head before the woman. This should be done 19 times. Then some sweets should be placed before her on an entire plantain leaf, with a glass of water made fragrant with camphor. Then the formula—*Etad suvāsita jalaṃ śrī śrī rasamayī ca nama nama* should be recounted three times in the mind, and one leaf of Tulasī (sacred plant) should be offered. This should be done 5 times. Then the woman should be made to sit on a bed, and the formula—*Ślīng klīng rasaprema nama nama* should be

নম নম॥ পুষ্প॥ তদুপরি রসমই নায়িকা আসন পরি বসাইবে। তদুপরি নাইকার স্নান সেবা। এতৎ জল স্নানং শ্রীশ্রীরসমই নম নম। এই স্নান সেবা, তদুপরি পূজা। আগে রসমইর প্রেম গাইত্রিকে জপ করিবে, পঞ্চবিংশতি পর্ব্ব। অথ প্রেম গাইত্রি। প্লীং প্রেম রসমই, শ্লীং রসসিন্ধু বিন্দহি, ক্লীং রসবিলাসিনে স্বাহায়াৎ। এই প্রেম গাইত্রি জপ। পরে পূজা। পূজার মন্ত্র শ্লীং রসমই এতৎ গন্ধপুষ্পং তব চরণে নম নম। এই মন্ত্র তিন পর্ব্ব করিয়া জপ করিবেক, আর এক অঞ্জলি পুষ্প দিয়া এক প্রণাম। এই মত ঊনবিংশতি অঞ্জলি। পরে মিষ্টান্ন যেমন আয়জন থাকে তাহা অঙ্গুড়িয়া কদলী পত্রে সম্মুখে ধরিবেক। আর এক পাত্রে জল কর্পূর সহ পরে সমর্পণ মন্ত্র। এতৎ সুবাসিত জলং শ্রীশ্রীরসমই চ নম নম। এই মন্ত্র তিন পর্ব্ব করিয়া জপ করিবেক, আর এক পত্র তুলসী দিবেক। এই মত পঞ্চ পত্র। পূজা পরে শয্যা আসন করিবেক। তদুপরি নাইকা আসনে বসাইবেক। বসাইয়া আরোপ যুগল মন্ত্র একবিংশতি পর্ব্ব জপ করিবেক। অথ যুগল আরাধনা গাইত্রি বিজ ভাব উল্লাস সহ। শ্লীং হ্লীং ক্লীং কিশোর ভাব উল্লাস

recounted in the mind 25 times, and another formula—*Sliṅg hliṅg kliṅg yugala kiśora bhāva-ullāsa nama nama* should be recounted 19 times. The woman should then be seated on the left thigh of the man who will then recite 25 times the formula—*Hliṅg kliṅg kandarpa svāhā.* The woman will then stand on the seat with her hands uplifted, and after some other mystic rites both the man and the woman should lie down on the bed. * * * Now, the formula—*Kliṅg śliṅg yugala kiśorāya svāhā* should be recited 19 times. The effect of such recitation should be the passing of seminal fluid through the middle nerve, which will then go upwards towards the region of Paramātmā. If it passes through the other two nerves, the result will be either the procreation of children, or mere waste of energy. It is only the middle nerve which is the source of perpetual enjoyment.

7. *Jāpa.*—At dawn they should take leave of each other and go to their respective abode. Then feeling the pangs of separation, the woman should recount in the mind the formula—*Kliṅg rasarāja punarmilitaṃ svāhā,*

নম নম। এই মন্ত্র উনবিংশতি পর্ব্ব জপ করিবেক। আসনপরি বাম উরুতে বসাইয়া পরে নাএক কন্দর্পারাধ্য করিবেক। কন্দর্প আরাধনা মন্ত্র। হ্লীং ক্লীং কন্দর্প স্বাহা। এই কন্দর্প আরাধনা মন্ত্র পঞ্চবিংশতি পর্ব্ব জাপ করিবেক। তদুপরি রসমই নায়িকা আসন'পরি ভূজ উর্দ্ধ করি দাণ্ডাইবে। * * * পরে নাএক নায়িকা শয়ন। * *। * যুগল মন্ত্র জাপ করিবেক, উনবিংশতি পর্ব্ব ইতি। অথ যুগল মন্ত্র। ক্লীং শ্লীং যুগল কিশোরায় স্বাহা। ইহার গুণ কি। ইহাতে নাএক নায়িকা মহারস সংযোগ হইবেক। হইয়া ইড়া, পিঙ্গলা, সুসম্না তিন নাড়ি হয়। বাই পিত্তি শ্লেষা বলি লোকে যারে কয়॥ বায়ুগত্ত হইলে রস শূন্ত পথে জায়। তাহারে সকল লোকে বন্ধা বলি কয়॥ পিত্তিতে প্রবেশিলে পীরিতি অঙ্কুর। নাএক নাইকা রসে সদা রহে ভোর॥ শ্লেষা ধাতুতে প্রবেশিলে জিবাত্মা সঞ্চারে। জীবের ক্রিয়া করে যেই থাকে এসংসারে॥ এই হেতু * কালে যুগল মন্ত্র জপে। মন্ত্র দ্বারে মহারস মধ্য নাড়ি পাবে॥ উর্দ্ধরন্ধ্রে পড়ি রস

and the man do the same with the formula—*Śling rasamayī punarmilitaṃ svāhā.*

8. Ārādhanā.—Nothing in particular is said under the heading Ārādhanā. This must have been performed in the rites noted above, which collectively may be taken as *ārādhanā* or worship.

This shows how the mystic culture advocated by the Tantrics has been adopted by the Sahajiyās within the fold of their own religion. In fact, we have here an account of the later form of Tantricism prevalent in Bengal even up to the present day. The number of those who follow Tantricism in actual practice is very limited now-a-days, but the Sahajiyās who culture love by following the method narrated above are not so very limited in Bengal even among the common people.

By practising the mystic rites, the Tantrics, we are told, arouse the Serpent Power (Kuṇḍalinī Śakti), but the Sahajiyās push up the Energy through the middle (Suṣumnā) nerve. In both the doctrines, the result is practically the same, that is, the union of the individual Energy with the Supreme Energy located in the head. So, the Sahajiyās have the same end in view as the

চলে সেই পথে। মিশাইয়া রহে সেই পরম আত্মাতে॥ * * *॥ যুগল রস কারে বলি কেমন সে রস। নাএক নাইকা এক মনের বিলাস॥ কায় মন বাক্য নাএক নাইকার হয়। উজ্জ্বল শৃঙ্গার বলি তাহারে যে কয়॥ এই হেতু * * কালে যুগল মন্ত্র আরাধনা।

তদুপরি জাপ। এই সব ব্যবহারে নিশি পোহাইবে। নাএক নাইকা উঠি নিজ ঘর জাবে॥ নিজ ঘর যাইয়া দোঁহে অস্থির হইলা। দোঁহে দোঁহাকার মন্ত্র জপিতে লাগিলা॥ ইহার মন্ত্র। ক্লীং রস রাজ পুনর্মিলিতং স্বাহা। এই মন্ত্র নাএকের, ইহা নাইকা জাপ করিবেক। পরে নাইকার মন্ত্র। শ্লীং রসমই পুনঃ মিলিতং স্বাহা। এই মন্ত্র নাএক জাপ করিবেক। ইতি। নাইকা সাধন এই কহিলাম নিগূঢ়। বুঝিবে রসিক জন না বুঝিবে মূঢ়।

Tantrics, namely, the union of the personal soul with the Supreme Being both located in the microcosm of the human body. Both the cultures are mystic in nature, and only those who have adopted them under the proper guidance of the expert Gurus, have the right to say how far they are successful in producing the desired effect.

We have mixed with the Sahajiyās, and talked to them about their doctrine and practices, and found that they have implicit faith in such culture. Those who are followers of this cult aim at not having any issue; they say that by rigid adherence to the tenets and practices mentioned in their religious texts in which they receive instructions from their Gurus, they receive simply the joy of sexual commerce without any seminal discharge, and without it being vulgarised as a process of procreation. A true Sahajiyā can never have offspring as a result of his Sādhanā or culture with his Nāyikā. If any issue is born, the parties forfeit their claim to the Sahajiyā name.

Such is the view or the outward profession of those who openly avow this doctrine, but the outsiders may be suspicious, and inclined to think of the existence of many a physical offence and crime in the secret practices. There are, however, clear references to the process of controlling the energy, found in the writings of the Sahajiyās. In the Rāgātmikā *padas* attributed to Caṇḍīdāsa there is the hint of regulating the breath during conjugal union by means of which the loss of energy can be avoided.[1] It is also maintained that by

[1] প্রেমের যাজন শুন সর্ব্বজন
অতি সে নিগূঢ় রস।
যখন সাধন করিবা তখন
এড়ায় টানিবা শ্বাস॥

pushing the energy upwards during the process of Sādhanā, a man may attain to the state of divine similarity, and may enjoy hundreds of women without any seminal discharge. A man of this type is really a true Rasika.[1]

In the Calcutta University Manuscript No. 3437 we have another process of a less mystic nature described by Taraṇī Ramaṇa under the authority of Caṇḍīdāsa who is traditionally believed to have been a follower of the Sahajiyā doctrine. It is there stated that a man can acquire perfect mastery over his passion, if he observes with patience the practices narrated below :— For the first four months he should serve as a servant the feet of the Nāyikā he adopts as his partner in spiritual culture. He should sleep under her feet, always keeping himself well-controlled in passion. For the next four months the services should be continued as before, but the man should during this period sleep by her left side perfectly controlled as before. For the next four months the services should be extended to her

তাহা হইলে মন বায়ু সে
আপনি হইবে বশ।
তাহা হইলে কখন না হইবে পতন
জগৎ ঘোষিবে যশ॥

Song No. 781.

[1] ঊর্দ্ধরেতা হয়ে যদি করয়ে সাধন।
সাক্ষাৎ ব্রহ্মময় হয় সেই মহাজন॥
কামিনী সম্ভোগ শত যদ্যপি সে করে।
তবু বিন্দুপাত তার কভু নাহি ক্ষরে॥
প্রকৃত রসিক হয় সেই মহাজন॥
তিনিই রতির দাস সদা সর্ব্বক্ষণ॥

Kaḍacā by Svarūpa, Part I, p. 9.

whole body, but the manner of sleeping should be changed at will. For the next four months the man should serve her feet, but sleep in her embrace. * * * Proceeding in this manner he should soon acquire the power of controlling his passion.[1]

The Sahajiyās lay great stress on this sort of culture, because it is their firm belief that the passion can be effectively checked by this means. They maintain that the element of passion that is in our body is like the milk, which is to be purified in the fire that is in the woman.[2] The Vivarta-Vilāsa says—"Now, hear about the nature

1 চারিমাস আগে তার চরণ সেবিয়া।
পদতলে শুতি রবে স্বভাব লইয়া॥
পুন আর চারি মাস চরণ সেবিয়া।
বামভাগে শুতি রবে স্বভাব লইয়া॥
পুনরূপি চারিমাস সর্ব্বাঙ্গ সেবিয়া।
ছন্দে বন্দে শুতি রবে স্বভাব লইয়া॥
আর চারি মাস তার চরণ সেবিয়া।
হৃদয়ে রাখিবে তারে স্বভাব লইয়া॥
এই মত করণেতে রতি স্থির হবে।
সাবধান হয়ে চন্দ্র চালন করিবে॥
pp. 29-30.

2 এই দেহে প্রাকৃত রস দ্রব দুগ্ধ হয়।
অগ্নি আবর্ত্তন হৈতে * * শুদ্ধ হয়॥
এই রসে কর তুমি অগ্নি আবর্ত্তন।
অখণ্ড মধুর হবে শুদ্ধ হৈলে মন॥
ইহার অনল হয় প্রকৃতির সঙ্গ।
ক্রমে ক্রমে বিরাগ যাইয়ে হবে রঙ্গ॥
প্রকৃতি অনলে রস কর আবর্ত্তন।
স্বভাব ধীরতা হয়, গুরুকে স্মরণ॥
U. M. No. 3437, pp. 29-30.

of the Bāhya Parakīyā. Just as milk is usually boiled with the help of fire, so the Gosvāmīs (Vaiṣṇava saints) have utilised the fire that is in women (for the purpose of purifying the passion).[1] It is, therefore, quite clear that the women so taken are simply means to an end. "Just as the traveller walks over the road to arrive at his destination, so in the culture of love the devotee should have a fixed goal for the realisation of which he should take a woman." [2] As soon as the object is realised there is no necessity of women any longer. This idea has been expressed in a beautiful way by two similes quoted below from the Premavilāsa.[3] "Beehives are filled up with honey collected from many flowers. When the honey is collected, the flowers are of no use to the

Women are means to an end.

1 বাহ্য পরকীয়া এবে শুন ওহে মন।
অগ্নিকুণ্ড বিনে নহে দুগ্ধ আবর্ত্তন॥
প্রকৃতির সঙ্গে যেই অগ্নিকুণ্ড আছে।
অতএব গোস্বামীরা তাহা যজিয়াছে॥

p. 97.

Also
রতিরূপ আত্মা তারে করহ শোধন।
বাণরূপে অগ্নি দিয়া করহ যাজন॥
তবে সংস্কার হইয়া হইবে নির্ম্মল।

Ibid, p. 43.

2 রাগ সাধনের এমনি রীত।
সে পথিকজনার যেমতি চিত॥

Caṇḍīdāsa (P. E.), Song No. 786.

3 মধু আনি মধুমাছি চাক করে যবে।
নানান পুষ্পের মধু যোগ করি তবে॥
বহু পুষ্প হৈতে মধু করে আয়োজন।
সেই পুষ্পে পুনঃ তার কোন্ প্রয়োজন॥

bees." It is also said that "in a dark room, light is used to drive away darkness, and to ascertain the positions of things it contains. As soon as this is done the use of light can be dispensed with."[1] The utility of women in spiritual culture is of this nature.

Injunctions against passionate indulgences.

It must be said to the credit of the Sahajiyās that though they adopt women for spiritual culture, yet they have the strongest injunctions against the passionate indulgence of any kind in the company of women. The Premānandalaharī says that the supreme bliss can never be realised by the man who gives himself up to the pleasure of the senses. This leads to the loss of energy, and brings weakness and disease.[2] The Ānandabhairava also says that the man who touches women for the pleasure of the body, can never get emancipation in many

[1] দীপ হস্তে করি যদি প্রবেশয়ে ঘরে।
তিমির করিয়া ধ্বংস দীপ্তিমান করে॥
যেখানে যে দ্রব্য তাহা হয় বর্ত্তমান।
পশ্চাৎ প্রদীপে আছে কোন্ প্রয়োজন॥

Bengali Typical Selections, pp. 1663-65.

[2] যদি বাহ্য সুখে সদা মগ্ন মোর মন।
তবে ত না পাবে ভাই, সে আনন্দ ধন॥
বাহ্য রতি পীরিতিতে মজে যার মন।
সে ভাবে কেবল হয় ওজের স্খলন॥
দুর্ব্বল শরীর হয় বল নাহি রয়।
শেষে নানা রোগগ্রস্ত কলেবর হয়॥

p. 9.

সর্ব্বদা চরম ধাতুর হানি না করিয়া।
ঊর্দ্ধরেতা ভাবে ভজ প্রকৃতি লইয়া॥
আনন্দ লহরে তবে ভাসিবে সদাই।

p. 10.

births, and he is also punished by the God of Death.[1] The Rasatattvasāra says that the man should select a woman of particular description with whom he would practise spiritual culture, always keeping himself aloof from the enjoyment of sensual pleasure.[2] The Rasasāra puts it in the mouth of Caṇḍīdāsa who is there represented as having said to Rāmī that in the culture of love the man should behave like a woman, and the woman should give up lust as they themselves had done.[3]

Also

নতুবা প্রকৃতি সঙ্গে মরণ নিশ্চয় ॥
বিন্দুপাতে আত্মহত্যা পাতকেতে মজে ।
অন্তিমে পতন তার রৌরবের মাঝে ॥

Kaḍacā by Svarūpa, Part I, p. 7

1 দেহরতি সম্বন্ধিয়ে পরশে প্রকৃতি ।
কোন জন্মে ২ তার নিস্তার না হয় ।
ভোগ ভূঞ্জায় তারে যম মহাশয় ॥

p. 8.

2 সেই সে রসিকা নারী হৃদয়ে রাখিয়া ।
সাধিবে আপন ধর্ম্ম রতি নিবারিয়া ॥

p. 9.

আপনি পুরুষ প্রকৃতি হইবে, প্রকৃতি রতি না করে ।
তোমা আমা যেন রতি শূন্য হেন, এমতি হইলে পারে ॥

p. 47

Marma Parakīyā Culture.

Let us now take up the subject of Marma Parakīyā. In the sphere of this mental culture the idea of Svakīyā and Parakīyā is quite different from what we have stated before in connection with the practical culture of love. The main idea is centred round the differentiation between Kāma (desire) and Niṣkāma (freedom from desire). From the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta we know that whatever is done for the satisfaction of one's own self is Kāma.[1] Sensuality is called Kāma, because therein we find the desire of self-enjoyment guiding the activities of men. But the term has a wider application. It signifies that whatever is done with a desire for gain or enjoyment is the work of Kāma, and it is, therefore, stamped, as the Sahajiyās say, with the seal of Svakīyā, while the self-less action is Parakīyā.[2] In the Rāgamayī Kaṇā of Haridāsa this point has been clearly set forth in the description of Candrāvalī, a rival of Rādhā in the love of Kṛṣṇa. "She is immersed, as it were, in the stream of Kāma, which is all that she knows. She remains always mad after her own Kāma, like those who are full of desire. Because she does everything

Svakīyā is kāma, and Parakīyā is Niṣkāma.

Svakīyā is selfish, while Parakīyā is selfless action.

1 আত্মেন্দ্রিয় প্রীতি ইচ্ছা তারে বলি "কাম"।
Canto I, Chap. 4.

2 পরকীয়া রতি হয় নিষ্কাম কৈতব ॥
Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 14.

with a selfish motive, she is called a woman of the Svakīyā class."[1] This is the idea of Svakīyā in the sphere of mental culture. As Kāma is the chief characteristic of the Svakīyā people, so even those who undertake religious works with expectation of rewards fall, as the Sahajiyās say, into this class. In the Bṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā it is said that the Karmīs are Svīyās or Svakīyās.[2] And who are these Karmīs? It is maintained that they are Karmīs who perform even with devotion religious works of various kinds, in consequence of which they are born again and again in this world.[3] The Ratnasāra says—"Leave off everything adopted on the principles of the utility of work and knowledge, and give up the practices prescribed by the Śāstras (religious codes). Do not also follow the Vedic religion, for that is also based upon the Svakīyā principle. Works like giving food to the departed parents, feeding the relatives, going to Gayā for offering food to the ancestors, or to the

The Karmīs are Svakīyās.

[1] কামের স্রোত সদা বহে চন্দ্রাবলী স্থানে।
সে রমণী ইহা বই অন্য নাহি জানে॥
মত্ত হয়ে স্বকামেতে চন্দ্রাবলী রয়।
হইলে স্বকামী তাই এই মত হয়॥
নিজ হেতু যত কাম চন্দ্রাবলী স্থলে।
তার জন্য স্বকীয় ভাব সকলেতে বলে॥

p. 18.

[2] সিয়া পরকীয়া দুই কর্ম্মী জ্ঞানী হয়।

p. 9.

[3] ভক্তি পরায়না হৈয়া নানা কর্ম্ম করে।
কর্ম্ম বন্ধে সদা ফিরে কর্ম্মী বলি তারে॥

p. 11.

Ganges for taking sacred bath are of this kind."[1] The best specimens of such denunciations are found in the Premabhakti-Candrikā, from which we quote a few typical passages :—

Svakīyā denounced by the Vaiṣṇava writers.

"Religious activities based on the principles of knowledge and works, are dangerous like poison. Those who take them like drops of ambrosia roam in thousand births among the lower animals, eating loathsome things, and they go down to perdition."[2]

"They are false devotees who adopt the ways of knowledge and work. Do not follow them, but take to the path of pure devotion."[3]

"The followers of austerities like the Yogīs and the Nyāsīs, and those who adopt the ways of knowledge and work, as well as those who worship sundry gods and practise religious contemplation, should be kept at

[1] ছাড় অন্য জ্ঞান কর্ম্ম বিধি আচরণ।
নাহি দেখ বেদ ধর্ম্ম স্বকীয়া সাধন॥
জ্ঞান কাণ্ড কর্ম্ম কাণ্ড বিধি আচরণ।
পিতৃমাতৃ ক্রিয়া কাণ্ড কুটুম্ব ভোজন॥
গয়া গঙ্গা যায় আর পিণ্ড দান করে।

p. 38.

[2] জ্ঞান কাণ্ড কর্ম্ম কাণ্ড কেবল বিষের ভাণ্ড
অমৃত বলিয়া যেবা খায়।
নানা যোনি সদা ফিরে কদর্য্য ভক্ষণ করে
তার জন্ম অধঃপাতে যায়॥

U. M., No. 1163, p. 5.

[3] কর্ম্মী জ্ঞানী মিছাভক্ত না হবে তার অনুরক্ত
শুদ্ধ ভজনেতে কর মন।

Ibid, p. 4.

a distance. The commonplace ideas of work, religion, sorrow and grief should be given up."[1]

In the Caitanya-Maṅgala of Locana Dās, it is said that the love of Kṛṣṇa can only grow in the mind when the paths of work and knowledge are given up, and so one should not adopt such means.[2] In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, the Karmīs and the Jñānīs (followers of the path of knowledge) are spoken of as persons who do not possess divine love.[3] Works of this nature are denounced because the object of those who adopt them is to gain merit by virtue of which they expect to taste the pleasures of a life in heaven. In fact, the men of the world generally pray to God for wealth, children, fame, power, and knowledge, etc. All religious activities, sacrifices, fastings, austerities, pilgrimages and liberalities are undertaken with a purpose. As the desire is there, whatever may be the nature of works, they

[1] যোগী ন্যাসী কর্ম্মী জ্ঞানী অন্যদেব পূজক ধ্যানী
ইহলোক দূরে পরিহরি।
কর্ম্ম ধর্ম্ম দুঃখ শোক যেবা থাকে অন্য যোগ
ছাড়ি ভজ গিরিবরধারী॥

Ibid, p. 2.

[2] জ্ঞান কর্ম্ম উপেক্ষিলে কৃষ্ণপ্রেমা হয়।
ইহা জানি জ্ঞান কর্ম্ম না কর আশ্রয়॥

p. 179.

[3] প্রভু কহে কর্ম্মী জ্ঞানী দুই ভক্তি হীন।

Canto II, Chap. 9.

Also অজ্ঞান তমের নাম কহি যে কৈতব।
ধর্ম্ম অর্থ কাম মোক্ষ বাঞ্ছা আদি সব॥
তার মধ্যে মোক্ষ বাঞ্ছা কৈতব প্রধান।
যাহা হৈতে কৃষ্ণ ভক্তি হয় অন্তর্দ্ধান॥

Canto I, Chap. 1,

all fall within the category of the Svakīyā class, and are, therefore, held in low esteem, as we have pointed out before, not only by the Sahajiyās but also by the advanced Vaiṣṇavas.

In the Brahmanical works also.

Such denunciations are also found in the Gītā and the Upaniṣads. The Gītā says :—"The fools speak of the ways of religious sacrifices, which appear charming to those who are wanting in sound judgment. The enjoyment of wealth and pleasure, and the happiness of heaven according to one's own conception, are considered by these people as the *summum bonum* of life, and so they perform religious acts longing for enjoyment in after-life. They can never realise a state of perfectly unqualified devotion."[1] And elsewhere the same work maintains that the people hold sacrifices according to rules prescribed by the Śāstras with the object of enjoying heaven after death. They go to the heaven of Indra, and there enjoy pleasure according to their own merits. But when the merits are exhausted by enjoyment, they are born again in this world. In this way repeated births and deaths are experienced by those who adopt the path of Karma or work.[2] Some of the Upaniṣads also speak in the same strain. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad says :—"Just as the things produced by agriculture are exhausted by use, so the heaven secured by merits melts away by enjoyment in the other world."[3] The Kaṭha-Upaniṣad says :—"Imperishable

[1] The Gītā, II. 42-43.
Also *ibid*, IV. 12, vii-23, etc.

[2] *Ibid*, IX. 20-21.

[3] 8-1-6.

heaven cannot besecured by perishable works."[1] The Muṇḍakopaniṣad says :—"Religious sacrifices are not reliable means of passing over to the other world."[2]

Though there is thus agreement of thoughts, yet we have this difference that what in the Brahmanical and Vaiṣṇava literature is designated by the terms Sakāma, Niṣkāma, Āsakti, Anāsakti, etc., is spoken of by the Sahajiyās as "Svakīyā" and "Parakīyā." But such terminological differences are immaterial to us, for we are concerned more with the signification than with the formal denominations. We thus find that in the sphere of Marma culture, Svakīyā does not mean woman united by bond of marriage, but works done with aselfish motive. So also Parakīyā does not mean another man's wife, but selfless task. Henceforth it will be found that there is always a basis for philosophical interpretation in the sphere of Marma culture, and that there is nothing material in the conception of the Sahajiyās when they speak of this kind of culture, for this higher aspect of the doctrine is absolutely free from grossness of any kind.[3]

Parakīyā better than Svakīyā.

But the Sahajiyās consider Parakīyā better than Svakīyā. In the sphere of Marma culture this means that selfless work is better than selfish action. The Gītā says :—"You should perform work without being attached to it," for "Kāma is the enemy of the wise ; though it is pleasant at first,

1 2-10.

2 1-2-7.

3 উজ্জ্বল পরকীয়া রসে বিশুদ্ধ প্রকৃতি।

Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 12.

it destroys wisdom."[1] Therefore, one should work by keeping himself free from the influence of Kāma, for what is done with attachment is inferior to that undertaken with no desire at all.[2] The Sahajiyās do not, therefore, travel on a new path when they say that Parakīyā is better than Svakīyā.

Svakīyā and Parakīyā as Aisvaryya and Mādhuryya.

In the sphere of Marma culture the Sahajiyās view Svakīyā and Parakīyā from another standpoint also. In the Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, Parakīyā is said to be the worship of God based on the culture of sweet emotions, while Svakīyā is the worship of the grandeur of God realised through intellectual speculation.[3] The former means, as we shall point out elsewhere, that God is to be loved with the sentiment of a wife, mother or a friend, in other words, like one who is nearest and dearest to our heart; but the latter form of worship rests upon the conception that God is the all-powerful Being who possesses supernatural potentialities. The conception of such grandeur makes him infinitely superior to us, and he is therefore worshipped more with awe and reverence than with real love. The Caitanya-Caritāmṛta says that this kind of worship is never

[1] The Gītā, III. 19, 39, etc.

[2] *Ibid*, II. 49.

[3] পরকীয়া রতি হয় মাধুর্য্য করণ।
ঐশ্বর্য্য ঈশ্বর-রতি স্বকীয়া রতি হন॥

p. 14.

And ঈশ্বরত্ব ভজন করয়ে যেই জন।
স্বকিয়া করয়ে তারা জানিবে কারণ॥
পরকিয়া ভাবনা করয়ে জেই জনা।
ঈশ্বর না মানে, জানে নিজ উপাসনা॥

U. M., No. 591, p. 10.

pleasing to God.[1] The superiority of Parakīyā is thus established on this standpoint as well.

Marma Parakīyā classified.

The Marma Parakīyā is of two kinds :—(*i*) Jñānī Parakīyā, in which spiritual realisation comes from wisdom through intellect, and (*ii*) Śuddha Parakīyā, or the Parakīyā of pure love. The Vṛhatpremabhakti-Candrikā has clearly distinguished between these two kinds of Parakīyā. It says—"We hear of the Parakīyā of Bhagavān (Kṛṣṇa); that is Jñānī Parakīyā, but not Śuddha Parakīyā." [2] Now, what are the characteristics of these two kinds of Parakīyā ? There are various aspects of this Jñānī Parakīyā each of which requires separate treatment. In the first place, it is maintained that the Jñānī Parakiyā is based upon the conception of miraculous happenings due to the mysterious potentiality of God as narrated in the Bhāgavata.[3] We know from this work that Kṛṣṇa, while enjoying the Parakīyā love of the Gopīs, brought into play his mysterious faculties. It is said that he created by his divine power forms of the Gopīs, which were kept at home. So, when he sported with them in the forest of the Vṛndāvana, their husbands found the presence of their wives near them

[1] ঐশ্বর্য্য-শিথিল প্রেমে নাহি মোর প্রীত।

Canto I, Chap. 3.

[2] ভগবানের পরক্রীয়া ভরথ মুখে শুনি।
শুদ্ধ পরক্রীয়া নহে, পরক্রীয়া জ্ঞানী॥
জ্ঞান মার্গে পরক্রীয়া ভগবান কৈল।

p. 8.

[3] জ্ঞানি পরকীয়া ধর্ম্ম কহে মায়াশ্রিতে।
ইহার প্রমাণ দেখ শ্রীমৎ ভাগবতে॥

Ibid, p. 9.

at home.[1] This sort of speculation about the mysterious faculties of God, and others of similar nature, fill the mind with awe and reverence not at all favourable for the growth of pure love which, according to the favourite conception of the Sahajiyās, subsists only among objects of the same class. So, the Parakīyā of this kind is called Jñānī Parakīyā, as distinguished from the Śuddha Parakīyā or the Parakīyā of pure love.

Parakīyā means Niṣkāma Dharma.

Secondly, the best form of jñānī Parakīyā is the doctrine of the Niṣkāma Dharma, or the religion of selfless action.[2] From the particulars of this aspect of religion as discussed in the Gītā (teaching that man should not think of himself but of the world beyond self, ascribing everything to God, and the like), we find that it is a doctrine of wisdom exercising our intellectual faculties for spiritual realisation, though the topic of devotion has often been introduced in the discussions. The Sahajiyās have also expressed themselves in a way almost identical to that of the Gītā. Speaking how can a man become Niṣkāmī, the Ānanda-Bhairava says :—" Fix your mind on Kṛṣṇa and ascribe everything to Him. Do not think of your own sorrow and joy, and so be ever joyful.[3] In the Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, we have—" He who by

[1] Bhāgavata, 10-33-37.

[2] পরকীয়া রতি হয় নিষ্কাম কৈতব ।
Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 14.

Also নির্ম্মল রাগের ধর্ম্ম নিষ্কাম ভজনে ॥
Ibid., p. 15.

নিষ্কামের পর কৃষ্ণ পরকীয়া রতি ।
Rasakadamva-kalikā, p. 5.

[3] আজ্ঞা কর কিরূপেতে হইব নিষ্কামী ।
সর্ব্ব সমর্পণ কর এই তার ঠাঞি ॥

means of spiritual knowledge has acquired a clear insight, does not find himself circumscribed by the dictates of the holy texts. He has no discrimination between the householder and the ascetic, for he is beyond the sphere of Māyā or ignorance. Possessing an ideal nature, he can discern equality in all objects of the world, and so he finds no difference between himself and others."[1] That these are some of the characteristic features of the Sahajiyā doctrine, has also been clearly set forth in the Amṛtarasāvalī thus—" He who knows what is the significance of the religion designated by the term Sahaja, finds his fear doubled. Now, what is the cause of such fear ? Because, the doctrine is a difficult one, in which the seeking of self means the destruction of the world beyond, whereas the losing of self marks the beginning of real consciousness. He is saved who can give himself up to the works of the world, and consider his own interest almost identical to that of others."[2] When a man

শ্রীনন্দ-নন্দন জ্ঞানে করহ ভজন।
তাঁর উপরে মন রাখ সর্ব্বক্ষণ॥
আপনার সুখ দুঃখ না ভাবিহ মনে।
সদত আনন্দময় দেখিবে নয়নে॥ p. 7.

[1] তত্ত্বজ্ঞানে বস্তু নিষ্ঠা হইল যাহার।
সেজন হইল তবে বেদবিধি পার॥
কিবা গৃহী উদাসীন নাহিক বিচার।
বস্তুনিষ্ঠা যার হৈল সেই মায়া পার॥
উত্তম স্বভাব হয়, জগতে সমজ্ঞান।
বেদাচার কুলাচার সকল তেজন॥
নিজ সুখ পর সুখ সমজ্ঞান করে।
নিজ পর তার নাহি দেখহ বিচারে॥ p. 6.

[2] সহজ কথাটী জে জনা জানে।
দ্বিগুণ ভয় তাহার মনে॥

can realise that in his individual existence he is not an isolated unit, but only a small bead in the garland of creation held fast by a common tie of union, and governed by the same universal law, and that in essence he is not at all different from the other objects of nature, being produced from the same Divine Potentiality whose grace is equally shared by all, then his ignorance will instantly vanish sinking all differences in the realisation of a common brotherhood. When this sort of perfection is attained by the culture of intellect through philosophical arguments it falls within the sphere of the Jñānī Parakīyā culture. In this sense the word Parakīyā is derived from *para* signifying "others," the doctrine teaching the philosophy of selfless action by advocating the ideal of common brotherhood in all objects of nature.

Parakīyā is the knowledge of the Supreme Being.

Thirdly, the term Para is also often used to designate Paramātmā, or the Supreme Being. Just as in the Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvali we have—" There is none else who is called Para except Paramātmā,"[1] so there are passages like—" Nārāyaṇa is Para (the best) knowledge, Para (the best) salvation, and Para (the best) goal,"[2] and " He is Nārāyaṇa who is called Para,"

ভয়ের কথাটি কহিব কারে ।
একে বাচিলে জগত মরে ॥
জগত বাচিলে আমি সে মরি ।
জগত ডুবিলে আমি সে তরি ॥
আমাতে জগত জগতে আমি
আমাকে করিতে জগত কমি ॥ p. 6.

[1] পরমাত্মা বিনে পর অন্য পর নয় । p. 18.

[2] নারায়ণঃ পরা বেদা নারায়ণঃ পরাক্ষরাঃ ।
নারায়ণঃ পরা মুক্তির্নারায়ণঃ পরা গতিঃ ॥

"He is the Para of the Paras (the best),"[1] etc., in the religious works of the Brahmins. Even the knowledge of the Highest is called Parā-Vidyā. 'There are two kinds of knowledge, one of which is called Parā and the other Aparā, the former aiming at the realisation of the Supreme Being."[2]

Hence Parakīyā, as derived from *para* signifying Paramātmā, means the knowledge of the Supreme Being. In the Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī we have a clear declaration that the knowledge of Paramātmā is the aim of the Sahajiyā doctrine.[3] Now, what is the nature of this knowledge? As we shall have to dwell on this subject in Chap. IV below, here we confine ourselves to bare hints that are necessary for giving a preliminary idea about this aspect of culture. "The Supreme Soul, otherwise called Paramātmā, is the First Cause of creation. The fourteen worlds (the whole universe) originated from him. He is identified with Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of Vaikuṇṭha (the highest heaven). When he experiences the desire of creation, he looks towards Māyā (Nature), and a spark from him enters into the womb of the latter and the mundane egg is produced. In this way he incarnates himself into visible forms, and thus our individual soul is only a part of the Supreme Soul. Paramātmā is ever-joyful, for he is the fountain of joy. He knows no sorrow, and is free from grief."[4] The

[1] নারায়ণঃ পরঃ। Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, 1-4-4.
পরঃ পরাণাং পুরুষঃ। *Ibid*, 1-11-43.

[2] Muṇḍ Up., 1-1-4-5.

[3] সহজ বস্তু পরমাত্মা জানিহ নিশ্চয়। p. 2.

[4] পরম পুরুষ কৃষ্ণ বৈকুণ্ঠের পতি।
ইচ্ছা হৈলে তিঁহো চান মায়া প্রতি॥

knowledge of the individual soul is thus intimately connected with the knowledge of Paramātmā. Even the human body has received great attention from the Sahajiyās in this connection. It is said that the culture of the body imparts the best spiritual knowledge, and that it is a necessary factor in the culture of Paramātmā[1]. The Sahajiyās have indulged in the philosophical speculations of various kinds in their conceptions about the human body. It is said that every body contains a male and a female element, the former being located in the right half, while the latter in the left. At the origin of creation there was unity, then came the division to be united again in individual form.[2] It is also maintained that in this body

গোলোক বৈকুণ্ঠ হৈতে করেন ইক্ষণ।
তেজরূপী পরমাত্মা প্রবেশ তখন॥
গর্ভাধান হয় সহজ মানুষের জন্ম।
দেহে আসি পরমাত্মা হন অবতীর্ণ॥
সুখময় পরমাত্মা সুখের নিধান।
সুখ বিনু দুখ আদি কিছু নহে আন॥ etc.

Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, p. 2.

[1] দেহের সাধন হয় সর্ব্বতত্ত্ব সার।
পরমাত্মা সাধন বিনে কিবা আছে আর॥

Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, p. 4.

[2] সকল শরীরে হয় অর্দ্ধাঙ্গ অবলা॥
পুরুষ প্রকৃতি দুই দেহ মধ্যে আছে॥

Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 4.

Also

এক প্রভু দুই হৈলা রস আস্বাদিতে।
দুয়ে এক হৈয়া পূর্ব্বে আছিলা নিশ্চিতে॥
এখন দুহেতে দেখ রহে এক হয়া।
দেহ মধ্যে দুই জন দেখ বিচারিয়া॥
বাম অঙ্গে প্রকৃতি, পুরুষ দক্ষিণে। etc.

Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, p. 7.

of ours there are several ponds, nerves, lotuses, ghāts, and eleven senses. The soul is by nature free, but it is bound down in the body for its connection with the senses. Unless they can be liberated from the influence of all evil tendencies, the soul is hampered in its march towards spiritual emancipation.[1] Speculations of this kind form the conception of the Sahajiyās about the nature of human body, the knowledge of which is considered important, because it is said that the material essence of the body nourishes the human soul, which in turn serves Paramātmā.[2] To sum up, this culture means the culture of self through right knowledge, and making an offering of the body after knowing the true nature of Paramātmā.[3] After all, this lies wholly in the intellectual plane, and within the sphere of the Jñānī Parakīyā culture.

The Śuddha Parakīyā.

This kind of Parakīyā is even considered inferior to what is called Śuddha Parakīyā or Parakīyā of pure love. Some sort of technical knowledge according to the teachings of sacred texts is necessary for the right conception of the Jñānī Parakīyā system, and hence it

[1] তিঁহ হন নির্ব্বিকার, তার বিকার নাই।
পঞ্চ জনা সঙ্গে রহে তেঞি নাই যাই॥

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 17.

[2] ভূতাত্মার দ্বারে হয় জীবের পোষণ।
জীবাত্মার দ্বারে পরমাত্মার সেবন॥

Nigūḍh.-Prak., p. 13.

[3] জ্ঞান যোগে নিষ্ঠা হৈঞা আত্মার সাধন।
পরমাত্মাতত্ত্ব জানি দেহ সমর্পণ॥

Ibid, p. 4.

is regarded as a culture of the Vaidhī class somewhat resembling the Svakīyā form, with this difference that the latter is based on Karma or work, while the former on Jñāna or knowledge. Both of them should, therefore, be given up in favour of Śuddha Parakīyā.[1]

Now, what is the nature of this kind of Parakīyā? In the doctrine of Śuddha Parakīyā there is no room for intellectual speculation, it being wholly based on the sentiment of pure divine love.[2] It is a thing of the mental cosmography, and religious formalities have no utility within the sphere of this culture.[3] It is called Parakīyā, because in this doctrine the devotee should love God with the intensity of a Parakīyā lover. "One should constantly think of God with that depth of feeling which is experienced by a young girl for her young and beautiful lover, and the darkness of the mind will pass away."[4] This, in short, is the principle of Śuddha

[1] কেবল বিধি মার্গে এই জ্ঞানী পরকিয়া।

Bṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā, p. 8.

Also

স্বিয়া পরকীয়া দুই কর্ম্মী জ্ঞানী হয়।
দুই ছাড়ি কর শুদ্ধ প্রেমের আশ্রয় ॥

Ibid, p. 9.

[2] বিশুদ্ধ সত্ত্বের কহি শুদ্ধ পরকিয়া।

U. MS. No. 2533, p. 5.

[3] অন্তস্ফুট ধর্ম্ম এই, বহিস্ফুট নয়।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 67.

[4] সুন্দর নায়ক দেখি সামান্য নায়িকা।
যেই ভাবে দেখে তারে হয়ে রাগাত্মিকা ॥
সেই ভাবে কৃষ্ণকে ডাকহ বার বার।
আপনি ঘুচিয়া যাবে মনের আন্ধার ॥

Karacā of Govinda Dās, p. 60.

Parakīyā. Here we have simply a Parakīyā ideal, but no adoption of a Parakīyā companion. No spiritual knowledge of any technical kind is also necessary. The man should simply be mad after love, always wailing for union with God like a deserted lover,[1] transforming himself, as the Sahajiyās say, into a woman, specially of the Parakīyā class.[2]

This is considered to be the most natural feeling of man for union with God, which was manifested by Caitanya Deva, specially in the last part of his life.[3] It is said that he was born with the body and feeling of Rādhā.[4] In fact his love-lamentations and songs, which manifest the depth of his feeling and the purity of his faith, show that he was at heart like Rādhā always longing for union with Kṛṣṇa when she was deserted by him. We quote below a few typical passages in illustration of this sort of love.

[1] মনেতে শূন্যতা, বাক্যে হাহা হুতাশ।

Cait. Carit., Canto II, Chap. 2.

[2] বিশুদ্ধ প্রেমের তত্ত্ব শুন মন দিয়া।
যার অল্প হিল্লোলে জুড়ায় দগ্ধ হিয়া॥
যুবতীর আর্ত্তি যথা যুবক দেখিয়া।
সেইরূপ আর্ত্তি আর না দেখি ভাবিয়া॥
এ কারণে ভক্তগণ ভজে যদু পতি।
পত্নীভাবে তার প্রতি স্থির করি মতি॥

Karacā of Govinda Dās, p. 10.

[3] অখণ্ড নিষ্কাম তার স্বাভাবিক রতি।
সেই স্বাভাবিক রতি চৈতন্য গোসাঞি॥

Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 11.

[4] অবতরি ভূমণ্ডলে চৈতন্য রূপেতে।
শ্রীরাধিকা ভাবকান্তি প্রেম আস্বাদিতে॥

Rasasāra, p. 6.

"What shall I do to be united with Kṛṣṇa? Where is my lover who plays on flute? To whom can I reveal the pangs of my heart, and who will measure the depth of my sorrow? My bosom bursts, as it were, for being separated from him."[1]

"For anxieties due to the separation of Kṛṣṇa, I have lost the balance of my mind, so I cannot even think of the means of getting him again. I cannot ask my maids about this, for they have also gone mad with sorrow. What shall I do now, and where shall I go to be united with him? Indeed, I cannot live without Kṛṣṇa."[2]

"Dear friends! Show me where Kṛṣṇa is. My heart bursts when I do not see him even for a single moment. The maids of Vraja are like water-lilies scorched by the sun of desire, but Kṛṣṇa is like the moon who revives

[1] কাহাঁ করোঁ, কাহাঁ পাঙ ব্রজেন্দ্রনন্দন।
কাহাঁ মোর প্রাণনাথ মুরলী-বদন ॥
কাহারে কহিব কেবা জানে মোর দুঃখ।
ব্রজেন্দ্রনন্দন বিনু ফাটে মোর বুক ॥

Cait. Carit., Canto II, Chap. 2.

[2] এই কৃষ্ণের বিরহে উদ্বেগে মন স্থির নহে,
প্রাপ্ত্যুপায় চিন্তন না যায়।
যেবা তুমি সখীগণ বিষাদে বাউল মন
কারে পুছোঁ কে কহে উপায় ॥
হা হা সখী কি করি উপায় ?
কাহাঁ করোঁ। কাহাঁ যাঙ কাহা গেলে কৃষ্ণ পাঙ
কৃষ্ণ বিনু প্রাণ মোর যায় ॥

Ibid, Canto II, Chap. 17.

them with joy. Bring him once to me and keep me alive."[1]

This is the sort of divine love that was manifested by Caitanya Deva. In it the soul soars high up to heaven to embrace God with all the ardour of a devoted woman, disregarding all sorts of formalities either religious or conventional. Referring to the characteristics of this love it is said that in external manifestation it will show the pangs of burning poison, while the heart will experience the feeling of everlasting joy. It is like the chewing of hot sugar-cane, which is burning to the taste, yet difficult to be given up. Only those who have tasted it know that therein nectar is mixed up with poison.[2] To love God in this manner is the chief feature of the Śuddha Parakīyā. We shall speak more about this devotion as we go on.

[1] সখীহে ! কোথা কৃষ্ণ করাহ দর্শন ।
ক্ষণেক যাঁহার মুখ না দেখিলে ফাটে বুক
শীঘ্র দেখাও, না রহে জীবন ॥
এই ব্রজের রমণী কামার্ক-তপ্ত কুমুদিনী
নিজ করামৃত দিয়া দান ।
প্রফুল্লিত করে যেই কাহাঁ মোর চন্দ্র সেই
দেখাও সখি ! রাখ মোর প্রাণ ॥

Ibid, Canto III, Chap. 15.

[2] বাহে বিষজ্বালা হয় ভিতরে আনন্দময়
কৃষ্ণ প্রেমার অদ্ভুত চরিত ॥
এই প্রেমার আস্বাদন তপ্ত ইক্ষু চর্ব্বণ
মুখ জ্বলে, না যায় ত্যজন ।
সেই প্রেমা যার মনে তার বিক্রম সেই জানে
বিষামৃতে একত্র মিলন ॥

Ibid, Canto II, Chap. 2.

Summary.

We have here dealt with many aspects of the Sahajiyā doctrine, each of which is considered better than the preceding one. Bāhya culture in the company of woman which is allied to the Tāntric culture, is not of that excellence as the doctrine of the Sakāma and Niṣkāma Dharmma or the doctrine of Paramātmā. The latter regarded as a form of the Jñānī Parakīyā culture, is considered inferior to Śuddha Parakīyā manifested by Caitanya Deva. In fact each form of these cultures is suited to the taste of a particular class of people, and is inferior to others only on a comparative basis. In the second Canto of the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta is narrated the conversation that took place between Rāmānanda Rāy and Caitanya Deva. Whenever the former finished with the description of a particular form of culture, the latter used to say—"This is Bāhya, tell me if there is anything superior to this."[1] This is somewhat like that one going up to another in the next higher grade. We shall deal with other higher aspects of this culture towards the end of this book in Chapter IV.

[1] প্রভু কহে—"এহো বাহ্য, আগে কহ আর।"

Ibid, Canto II, Chap. 8.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY

1. *Ancient and Foreign*

Prema Dās in his Ānanda-Bhairava which is, as we shall see presently, one of the earliest books written about the Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā cult, says that spiritual culture like that adopted by the Sahajiyās had been in existence even in ancient time,[1] and Gaurī Dās in his Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī also makes a similar assertion.[2] In going to enquire into the truth of these important statements, we should bear in mind that we cannot expect to find traces of the doctrine exactly in that well-developed form in which it is found current among the Sahajiyās of the present day, for every religion of the world has undergone considerable change, and the form in which it first came into existence can nowhere be found with all its original characteristics in the later stage of its development among its more enlightened followers. Its tenets and practices have been changed, sometimes rejected or modified with additions when necessary, and its philosophy improved to a considerable degree in order to keep it in a state of living faith supplying inspiration to its followers of advanced views. Because progress is dynamical,

[1] এই মত সাধন ভজন পূর্ব্ব হৈতে আছে।

P. 1.

[2] সহজ ভজন সহজ করণ আছে সর্ব্বকাল॥

P. 24.

change is a necessary condition of growth. The Sahajiyā doctrine also is not an exception to this universal law, for we can reasonably expect to find traces of progressive development at different periods of its growth. But, for the sake of identification let us take up what is the most prominent feature of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal, by which we mean the practice of taking female companion for mystic culture. It is our first concern to see if we can discover parallels of this form of Sādhanā in the past. Whenever in ancient literature we find provision for performing religious rites in the company of Parakīyā women, we may think that the germ of the modern Sahajiyā practice was there, though it might have been in a rudimentary form. Besides, the phallic worship which was so very current in the ancient world, was usually attended with sexual excesses forming part of the religious ceremonies that had to be observed on such occasions. We shall, therefore, primarily base our enquiry from these standpoints without, at the same time, losing sight of other characteristics of the doctrine as we go on.

The ideal of Parakīyā is at least as old as the Vedas and the Upaniṣads, and there are unquestionable proofs of its existence in human society even before the beginning of the Christian era. "In the Ṛgvedic hymn (10-129-5) occurs the idea of the origin of the universe from a union of Svadhā (Nature) below, and Prayati (Power and Will) above, which sowed the seeds from which mighty forces arose. This was the germ of the Liṅga-in-Argha worship which was in later times fully developed into a popular creed. The Vedic Aryans, however, appear to have been opposed to the symbolical worship of this idea, and hated those who worshipped the

Śiśna or liṅgam."[1] It is further stated—"We find the mention of the Śiśnas (Ṛv., 10-27-19), or Śiśnadevas (Ṛv., 7-21-5 ;10-99-3 ; *i.e.*, those whose God was the Siśna or phallus), who were opposed to Indra-worship, and whom Indra defeated. This unmistakably goes to prove that there were tribes living in the Saptasindhu in Ṛgvedic times who worshipped the liṅgam and were opposed by the cultured Aryans."[2] The Atharva-Veda-Saṃhitā clearly refers to something like a Parakīyā union, which is there held out as a means of enjoying a united existence in after-life. It says (*vide* 9-5-27-28)—"The woman who after possessing a husband accepts another mate, may avoid separation from the latter by performing the ceremony of Aja-Pañcadona, and if the second husband observes the same function, they can together go to the same abode after death." This not only speaks of the union with a Parakīyā woman, but of certain religious practices that could be observed by the new couple for securing a place in heaven in the company of each other. Moreover, we find that provision is here made only for that woman who has a first husband, so that her companion in the religious ceremony should be her second mate. As in the selection of a Parakīyā woman, the Sahajiyās also speak of adopting one who has a husband at home, there is perfect agreement of thoughts in this respect in these two statements. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad, while dealing with the worship of Vāmadeva Sāmana, observes (*vide* 2-13-1)—"Let one realise the glory of Vāmadeva Sāmana in the act of generation, etc." In this verse there is a clause *na kāñcana pariharet*, which has been inter-

[1] Ṛgvedic Culture by Dr. A. C. Dās, p. 166.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 164.

preted by the celebrated Śaṅkarācāryya in the following manner—"He, who knows this Vāmadeva Sāmana, has his no binding as regards the law of sexual intercourse, vow being—'Let no woman be abandoned.'" This shows that in this particular form of worship, the devotee could enter into sex-relationship with any woman, and with any number of them. An idea similar to this is also prevalent among the common Sahajiyās.

The Kathā-Vatthu, a Buddhist work supposed to have been written before the Christian era, mentions a custom called "Ekādhippāyo" that was prevalent amongst the Andhras, Vetulyakas, and the Uttarā-Pathakas.[1] This means (*vide* XXIII, 1) that "sexual relation may be entered upon with a united resolve (Ekādhippāyena methuno dhammo sevitabbo). Such a vow may be undertaken by a human pair who feel mutual sympathy or compassion (not passion merely) and who worship in the same shrine and aspire to be united throughout their future lives."

The same work (Kathā-Vatthu, XXIII, 2) further states—"The infra-human beings enter upon sexual relations in the guise of the Arhants for the sake of dhamma" (Arahantānaṃ vaṇṇena amanussā methunaṃ dhammaṃ patisevanti). About this statement it has been observed that "the details of this controversy imply that the infra-human beings in certain regions entered upon sexual relations in the guise of the Arhants as a lesson meant to be conveyed to those wicked Bhikkṣus who had outwardly gentle manners and observed the rules of discipline. Buddhaghoṣa says that the quoted statement was made and defended by some of the

[1] Points of Controversy, pp. 365-66.

Uttarāpathakas. The conclusion which might be drawn from this is that among the uncivilised people in the Uttarāpatha, the North Western Frontier regions of India, there arose some Buddhist sects permitting their Bhikkṣus to enter upon sexual relations in religious matters."[1] From both these instances it is quite clear that there was prevalent among some Buddhist sects the custom of entering upon sexual relation for the cultivation of dhamma (as can be guessed from the phrases "dhammo sevitabbo" and "dhammaṃ patisevanti" quoted above).

In the Majjhima-Nikāya (Vol. I, p. 305), Buddha is said to have made the following remarks—"There are some Śramaṇas and Brāhmaṇas who are of this belief that they say that there is no harm in the acts of lust. They sport in sensuality in the company of female ascetics. Arguing they say this—'As a matter of fact, the venerable recluses and Brahmanical ascetics seeing the future dangers arising from the acts of lust, teach their abandonment, and enunciate the method of avoiding them.'"[2]

The importance of this statement put forth in the mouth of Buddha, reveals the fact that there existed a custom among certain sects of having intercourse with women in religious matters even in that remote age.

Let us now return to the primitive state of civilisation. Instead of putting down our own observations, we here quote from the works of scholars who have dealt with the subject of ancient sex-worship. It should be remembered that this worship was often conducted

1 The Calcutta Review, June 1927, p. 363.

2 *Ibid*, p. 362.

with sexual excesses which formed parts of the religious ceremonies that had to be observed on festive occasions. One author says—"We have evidences from a number of sources to show that sex was at one time frankly and openly worshipped by the primitive races of mankind. This worship has been shown to be so general and so widespread, that it is to be regarded as part of the general evolution of the human mind; it seems to be indigenous with the race, rather than an isolated or exceptional circumstance."[1] Nature worship was prevalent among the primitive races, whose chief concern was food and children. The Ṛgveda abounds in hymns praying for good rain and progeny, etc. Just as the rites of nature worship consisting of rain-making ceremonies, sun-dances, and numerous other procedures were carried out for the purpose of increasing the products of the earth, so the phallic ceremonies were the outcome of the desire of reproduction, the feeling associated with this instinct being raised to the dignity of religion. Thus arose the custom of sex-worship which was after all an unconscious social expression, playing an important part in the development of human mind. We here refer to an incident observed by Captain Cook during his voyages to one of the Southern Pacific islands. The missionaries of the expedition on this occasion assembled the members of the party for religious ceremony in which the natives joined. The primitive natives observed the ceremony with great respect, and then with due solemnity enacted their form of sacred worship. Quite to the astonishment of the white people, this ceremony consisted

[1] Sex-worship and Symbolism of Primitive Races, by S. Brown, p. 23. The rest of this paragraph is summarised from this book (*vide* pp. 27-8, 80-93).

of the open performance of the sexual act by a young man and a woman. This was entirely a religious ceremony and fittingly respected by all the natives present. That sexual union was thus held sacred by the primitive people throughout the whole world is quite evident from the records of phallic worship that was prevalent in Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Rome, China, Japan, Italy, India, Spain, Scandinavia, and other places of the earth. Comprehensive treatment of this subject can be found in the Primitive Symbolism by H. M. Westropp. The American Cyclopedia under the heading "Phallic Worship" says—"In early ages the sexual emblems were adorned as most sacred objects, and in the several polytheistic systems the act or principle of which the phallus was the type was represented by a deity to whom it was consecrated :—In Egypt by Khem, in India, by Śiva, in Assyria by Vul, in primitive Greece by Pan, and later by Priapus, among the Teutonic and Scandinavian nations by Frisco, and in Spain by Hortanes." This kind of worship, as we have said before, was usually observed with sexual excesses, and hence it is observed —"There is abundant evidence to show that there was a time in the centuries before Christ when prostitution (as we now call it) was held as a most sacred vocation." Herodotus (1.199) says—"The Babylonians have one most shameful custom. Every woman born in the country must once in her life go and sit down in the precincts of Venus, and there consort with a stranger .... When she has gone with him, and so satisfied the goddess, she returns home.......... A custom very much like this is found also in certain parts of the island of Cyprus." Strabo (XI, 14, 532) also speaks about a similar custom prevalent among the Armenians.

With the spread of Christianity these practices were bitterly opposed in the western countries, and finally they ceased to exist as national institutions. While they were thus discarded by the great mass of people, certain elements of the race clung to these primitive beliefs and customs even for a long time. Though the mysteries were officially forbidden in many countries, they were carried on secretly in a somewhat altered form even during the middle ages. The Gnostics belonged to one of these societies who continued the practice of mysticism. In their social organisation they used to advocate communal marriage, the wives being held as articles of common use. In this respect they resembled the Rosicrucians in many of their customs and practices. The latter introduced perverse sexual practices in their society. They are said not only to have countenanced homosexuality, but to have made it one of the principles of their beliefs. The Knights Templars formed another secret society of this nature. They were also charged with homosexuality. In the Witches' Sabbath women used to play a leading part. Special significance was attached to the generative organs, and it is needless to say that all kinds of sexual excesses followed. It is also said that the Knights of the Round Table of King Arthur had many customs similar to those of the Rosicrucians. Phallic principles were also associated with the Order of the Garter.

These are instances of the most crude form of worship retained as the remnants of primitive culture, the like of which to some extent is observed by a section of the Sahajiyās even at the present day. But the formal observances of this kind are merely the external appendages to the main stalk which, resting upon a sound

philosophical basis supports the central structure of the faith and reveals the true character of the doctrine. The Sahajiyā religion also has a higher aspect of this kind which aims, as we have seen, at the culture of love and beauty in the company of women for the attainment of a state of perfect bliss usually associated with the idea of immortality. It is to this aspect of the culture to which we now turn our attention. By looking back into the history of the remote past, we find that a system similar to this was in existence in Greece at the time of Socrates and Plato, which the latter had supported with philosophical arguments. We refer to the Banquet of Plato in which, in the form of dialogues, he has put forth in the mouths of Phædrus, Pausanius, Eryximachus, Aristophanes and Socrates almost all the principal characteristics of the mystic culture of love. We give below a brief summary of their speeches touching upon those points only which are of great importance to the study of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal. In doing so it is our necessity to be somewhat elaborative on many points with our comments and parallel quotations, for this is our first entry into the domain of the mysteries of love by following the arguments of a great philosopher whose writings are perhaps the earliest records of a scientific treatment of the philosophy of the subject.[1]

From the Speech of Phædrus

Love is of the highest dignity among the gods, and is in a peculiar manner the author of virtue and happiness

[1] In the following discussions we have quoted from the Selections from Plato, translated by Sydenham and edited by T. W. Rolleston.

to all of human kind. Love inspires in lovers force resistless. Lovers are only ready to die for another, and those who are true to love may be restored to life after death.

Comments.

Here Plato begins his discourse by describing the nature of love. That love is of the highest dignity among the gods is a proposition in which there is some novelty. In religion love is simply a means of realising God, but by deifying love which is here placed in the highest rank among the gods, Plato lays the foundation of a doctrine which aims at the worship of love. As the Sahajiyās are of the same persuation, they have also raised love to the status of its highest dignity. In modern Vaiṣṇavism of Bengal it is held that Rādhā was the incarnation of love,[1] and that Kṛṣṇa incarnated himself as Caitanya in order to taste this love symbolised in Rādhā,[2] thus making love an object of anxious solicitude of God.

The Sahajiyās, working on the principle that love is the only object of culture,[3] have also paid the highest tribute

[1] In the Ujjvalanīlamaṇī (Rādhāprakaraṇa) she is spoken of as মহাভাবস্বরূপেয়ম্। This idea has been expressed in the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta (Canto I, Chap. 4), in the form of "মহাভাবস্বরূপা শ্রীরাধা-ঠাকুরাণী" that is, "Rādhā symbolises supreme love."

[2] রাধাভাব অঙ্গী করি—ধরি তার বর্ণ।
তিন সুখ আস্বাদিতে হব অবতীর্ণ ॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

[3] প্রেম নিত্য সাধ্য বস্তু, সাধনের সার।
ইহা বিনা সাধ্য বস্তু কেহ নহে আর ॥

Amṛtaratnāvalī, pp. 10-11.

to love. It is said that Kṛṣṇa takes the dust of the feet of Rādhā,[1] and all the gods, holding love very dear to them,[2] took birth in the Vṛndāvana in the form of trees and creepers to kiss the dust of Rādhā's feet.[3] The idea of such exalted position of love is the chief feature of the Sahajiyā doctrine. That love is of the highest dignity

[1] শ্রীকৃষ্ণ লয়েন যাঁর চরণের ধূলি।

Rāgamayīkaṇā, p. 15.

[2] নারদ শারদ শুক সনাতন
দেবের দেবতা যত।
মহিমা কারণ ফলের মাধুরী
জানিবেক কত শত॥
এমন তরুর ফল ফলিয়াছে
যাহার উপমা নাই।
কত না মাধুরী ফলের ভিতর
না দেখি কনহ ঠাই॥
* * * *
ফল আস্বাদন করিতে সঘন
দেবের আরতি অতি।
চণ্ডীদাস বলে ফলের মাধুরী
কেবা সে জানব রীতি॥

Sāhitya-Pariṣad Patrikā, 1333, p. 223.

[3] আইস ধনি রাধা তুমি তনু আধা
অনন্ত ভাবিয়া ভাবে।
ভব বিরিঞ্চি তারা নিরন্তর
যে পদ পঙ্কজ লবে॥
শুক সনাতন পরম কারণ
ও পদ আশে।
ব্রজপুরে হেতা হয়ে গুল্ম লতা
ইহাতে করিয়ে বাসে॥

even among the gods, not to speak of the mortal, was fully realised by the Sahajiyās, who have built up an edifice of mystic culture on a foundation of this conviction.

II. How can love be the author of virtue and happiness to all of human kind? The argument advanced by Plato is of this nature :—An unworthy act becomes more shameful when it is seen by one who is loved. So, the sinners make it a point to hide their guilts from those they love. Now, if a man loves the whole world, he cannot do anything mean. Love is, therefore, the author of virtue. The idea that love when it embraces the whole world becomes the author of virtue has also been preached by the Sahajiyās but in a different way. They argue that every man loves himself, so that a man can truly love the whole world when he sees that there is no difference between self and the rest of the world.[1] In the highest perfec-

কেনে তরু লতা হইবে দেবতা
কিসের কারণে হেন।
ও পদ পঙ্কজ রেণুর লাগিয়া
এ হেতু তাহার গুন ॥

Caṇḍīdāsa's Song (P. E.), No. 131.

[1] শুদ্ধসত্ত্ব জীব যেই সদা নিষ্ঠাশীল।
সহজে অভেদ ভাবে দেখে যে অখিল ॥

Rasaratnasāra, p. 6.

Also,

সমস্ত জগত যদি আত্মরূপ হয়।
আত্মাভিন্ন নাহি যদি আর কিছু রয় ॥
আমি যথা আত্মরূপ পশু তাই হবে। etc.

Ibid, p. 38.

tion of love, it is said, a man becomes master of his own self, when he loves all the animate beings, and becomes a true lover.[1] In this way, the philosophy of Plato and the doctrine of the Sahajiyās speak about the same ideal of universal love.

III. The readiness of lovers to die for those they love, is a common characteristic of Love, but there is no other religion in which this ideal has been so much magnified and dogmatically followed as in the Sahajiyā doctrine. In the Rāgātmikā *padas* (mystic songs) of Caṇḍīdāsa there are found many statements advocating this ideal of perfect love. He says—"Love is really cherished by those who are always ready to die for those they love. They keep love ever fresh and new who wipe out their own existence for the sake of love.[2] The lover should sacrifice everything for love—his honour, good name, fear of public censure, etc.[3] His

[1] তিন গুণ খর্ব্ব হৈলে শুদ্ধসত্ত্ব হয়।
তৎপর বিশুদ্ধ সত্ত্বে প্রেমের উদয়॥

RatiVilāsapaddhati, p. 17.

জীবমাত্রে সভাতে জন্মায় প্রেম লাভ।
তবে সে জানিব তার অধীন স্বভাব॥

Rasakadamva, p. 49.

[2] মরমে মরমে জীবনে মরণে
জীয়ন্তে মরিল যারা।
নিতুই নূতন পীরিতি রতন
যতনে রাখিল তারা॥ (P. E.) Song No. 783.

[3] কলঙ্ক সাগরে সিনান করিবি
এলাইয়া মাথার কেশ।
নীরে না ভিজিবি জল না ছুঁইবি
সম সুখ দুঃখ ক্লেশ॥ (P. E.) Song No. 797.

love should also be of such intensity that on being separated from the beloved, the lover may feel the pangs of death even in life. Such death-like experience is only known to a limited few, but those who know it get new life, and such death opens the portals of life eternal.[1] That love may bring in life even after death is found illustrated in the story of Alcestis in the Greek mythology, but that of Indian Sāvitrī is unique in this respect. She restored to life her dead husband after satisfying the god of Death with her constancy, and sacrifice. The potentiality of love to conquer death is proclaimed in this manner.

And—

লাজ ভয় না মানে উন্মত্ত হয়া থাকে।
মরণ কলঙ্ক-লজ্জা কিছু নাহি দেখে॥

(U. M. No. 3174) Rasakadamva, p. 57.

1 মানুষ অভাবে মন মরিচিয়া
তরাসে আছাড় খায়।
আছাড় খাইয়া করে ছট্‌ফট্‌
জীয়ন্তে মরিয়া যায়॥
তাহার মরণ জানে কোন জন
কেমন মরণ সেই।
যে জনা জানয়ে সেই সে জীয়য়ে
মরণ বাঁটিয়া লেই॥
বাঁটিলে মরণ জীয়ে দুই জন
লোকে তাহা নাহি জানে। etc.

Song No. 780.

Also—

মানুষ বলি যারে জীয়ন্তে যে মরে
সেই সে মানুষ হয়।

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 5.

From the Speech of Pausanias

Love is of two kinds, (*i*) Celestial love, and (*ii*) Vulgar love. The manner of doing it makes a thing good or bad. Rightly performed it is right and honourable, wrongly, it is wrong and dishonourable. So it is with love.

Comments.

The differentiation between two kinds of love is also a pet theory with the Vaiṣṇavas and the Sahajiyās. What is pure is by them called love, but that of the vulgar sort is termed Kāma. When anything is done for self-interest and with a desire, it is the work of Kāma, but when it is done without any desire, ascribing everything to Kṛṣṇa (God), as it is put in a technical way, it is Prema (love).[1] There is, thus, perfect agreement in this respect between these two schools of thought.

From the Speech of Aristophanes

Aristophanes is explaining human nature and its tendency in a symbolical way. There existed hermaphrodites, one being who partook of both sexes, male

[1] কাম প্রেম দোহাকার বিভিন্ন লক্ষণ।
লৌহ আর হেম যৈছে স্বরূপ বিলক্ষণ॥
আত্মেন্দ্রিয় প্রীতি ইচ্ছা—তারে বলি কাম।
কৃষ্ণেন্দ্রিয় প্রীতি ইচ্ছা—ধরে প্রেম নাম॥
Cait. Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

এক বস্তু দুই কাম মদন যার নাম।
কামের বিষয় মদনের প্রেম দান॥
U. M. No. 615, p. 2.

সকাম আপন চেষ্টা ধরে কাম নাম।
কৃষ্ণ সুখ কাম সেই ধরে প্রেম নাম॥
U. M. No. 557, p. 5.

and female, in the same form. Every one of them had four hands and the same number of legs. They had two faces each and four ears. Their force and strength were prodigious, and their minds elevated and haughty. By Zeus they were then divided, every one of them into two halves, one male and the other female. When all of the human race were thus bisected, each section longed for union with its fellow half in order to regain that entity in union in which it formerly was. This secret desire of man to be mingled and melted in his beloved, and out of the two to be made one, is Love.

Comments.

Herein we find our nature explained with the help of a symbolical illustration. We have seen that the Sahajiyās also attach great importance to the knowledge of human nature. That knowledge of one's own self brings in the knowledge of the Sahajiyā doctrine, and that this body of ours is the principal object of culture, are assertions often met with in the Sahajiyā literature.[1] Among knowledge of various kinds about the human nature, that is held most important which is based upon the conception that man and woman are different externally, but they are really two sections of an undivided whole, the same soul reigning in both

[1] আপনা জানিলে তবে সহজ বস্তু জানে।

U. M. No. 611, p. 4.

দেহের সাধন হয় সর্ব্বতত্ত্ব সার।

Nigūḍhārtha-P., p. 4.

ভজনের মুল এই নরবপু দেহ।

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 4.

of them.[1] Love effects the union of these two sections, for man by nature is mad after love.[2] The desire of acquiring a state of completeness in union is thus the guiding principle of human nature. Here also the Sahajiyās sing in the same strain as Plato.

From the Speech of Socrates.

I. Socrates introduces the discourse thus—"Now, I think the easiest way that I can take, will be to lay before you the whole of the doctrine (of love) in the same manner and order in which I myself was examined and lectured on the subject by Diotima."

Comments.

In the first place we mark that Socrates went to a woman, Diotima by name, in order to be instructed in the secrets of the doctrine of love. This shows that in the matter of love, women

[1] পরমাত্মা পুরুষ প্রকৃতি রূপে জোড়া।
দুই তনু এক আত্মা কভু নহে ছাড়া॥

Nigūḍhārtha-P., p. 5.

একরূপ দুই হয় ভিন্ন দেহ নয়।
প্রকৃতি পুরুষ নাম বাহিরে দেখয়॥

Premānandalaharī, p. 8.

[2] এমতি জানিহ ভাই প্রকৃতি পুরুষ।
পীরিতি প্রেমের লাগি দোহে দোহার বশ॥

U. M. No. 2533, p. 2.

নাএক নাইকা তত্ত্ব রসের কারণ।

U. M. No. 615, p. 2.

মনুষ্য স্বভাব হয় অদ্ভুত কথন॥
বাউল স্বভাব তার বাউলের কর্ম্ম।
প্রেমরস আস্বাদয়ে এই তার ধর্ম্ম॥

U. M, No. 564, p. 11.

reign supreme. The Sahajiyā doctrine also is practically based on the theory that the secret of love is to be learnt before a woman or in the company of women. Caṇḍīdāsa going to enquire of Vāsulī about the mystic doctrine of love, was instructed by her to go to Rāmī, a washer-woman, for this purpose.[1] Moreover, the woman is here placed in the position of a guide in the culture of love, and this is the prevalent custom with the Sahajiyās also. Passages like those noted below are abundant in Sahajiyā literature.[2]

II. Secondly. Then, after preliminary discourses about the nature of love and its parentage, etc., Diotima says—"In the mysteries of love thus far, Socrates, you may be initiated and advanced. But to be perfected and to attain the intuition of the secret and inmost

[1] হাসিয়ে বাশুলী কয় শুন চণ্ডী মহাশয়,
আমি থাকি রসিক নগরে।
সে গ্রামে দেবতা আমি তাহা জানে রজকিণী,
জিজ্ঞাস গে যতনে তাহারে॥
(P. E.) Song No. 764.

[2] অন্তরে পীরিতি যজে প্রকৃতি আশ্রয়।
প্রেম রসে প্রকৃতির অনুগত হয়॥
U. M. No. 2520, p. 18.

এই লাগি পুরুষ হয় প্রকৃতি আশ্রয়।
U. M. No. 564, p. 4.

মঞ্জরি আশ্রয় হৈয়া করিবে সেবন।
Rasasāra, p. 43.

এবে এক সখীগণের ইহা অধিকার।
সখী হৈতে হয় এই লীলার বিস্তার॥
Cait.-Carit., Canto II, Chap. 8.

things, to which those others ought to be an introduction and preparation, I doubt whether you may be able, etc."

Comments.

We find here that a mere theoretical knowledge of the thing is not sufficient to make a man expert in the matters of love. That may simply be an introduction and preparation for entering into the mysteries of love, to which none can have access without undertaking a sort of practical culture in the company of the Rasikas.[1] The Sahajiyās fully believe in the necessity of this sort of culture with women.

III. Thirdly. Diotima now points out how by adopting practical culture in the company of the beautiful one can rise from the love of the physical beauty to that of the beauty of the soul, and finally to that everlasting beauty which pervades the whole world. She says—

"When the soul of any man has been teeming with the seeds of this wisdom from his youth (and of divine souls it is the native property thus to teem), as soon as he arrives at maturity of age,[2] he longs to sow them in the souls of others, and thus to propagate wisdom.

[1] পড়িলে শুনিলে প্রেম ভক্তি নাহি পাই।
সাধন ভজন করি নিত্যধামে যাই॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 54.

প্রেম যাতে জন্মে মন করহ উপায়॥
রসিকের সঙ্গ করি হেন তত্ত্ব জান।

Ibid, p. 64.

[2] কিশোর বয়স নিত্য প্রেমের স্বরূপ।

Ādyā-Sārasvata-Kārikā, p. 4.

কৈশোর বয়স কাম জগত সকল।

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

And he too, I suppose, looks about and searches for beauty where he may generate, for never can he generate on aught that is ugly and vile.[1] Meeting first then with outward beauty, that of the body, he welcomes and embraces it,[2] and turns away from where he sees deformity in the body. But if he has the good fortune to meet also with the beauty of a well-natured and generous soul,[3] he then entirely attaches himself to this double beauty, and to this partner of his soul he is now full of eloquence about virtue, and what a good man should be, and what are his objects, and he tries to educate his friend.[4]

[1] It is for this reason only that beautiful companions are taken for the culture of love, about which we have spoken elsewhere in detail in the description of adoptable women.

[2] যথা চিত্ত স্থির হয় তথা কর স্থিতি।

Rasasāra, p. 46.

কিশোরী স্বরূপ রূপ যেখানে দেখিবে।
সেরূপ নায়িকা অঙ্গ নয়নে রাখিবে॥

Sudhāmṛtakaṇikā, p. 18.

[3] শুনলো সজনি আমার বাত।
পীরিতি করবি সুজন সাত॥

Caṇḍīdāsa's Song No. 784.

[4] হইলে সুজাতি   পুরুষের রীতি
যে জাতি নায়িকা হয়।
আশ্রয় হইলে   সিদ্ধ রতি মিলে
কখন বিফল নয়॥

"To begin with, then, if his leader lead aright, he must love some one person of beautiful form, and with him generate noble and fair discourse. He must then consider that the beauty of one bodily form is sister to that of another bodily form; and if it is right for him to pursue outward beauty, he must lack understanding not to conceive that the beauty of all bodily forms is one and the same.[1] With this conception in the mind he must become a lover of all bodily forms, and he will relax that ardour of his, about one form in particular, and will despise it and hold it cheap. After this he must learn to esteem that beauty which is inward, and of the soul, to be of greater worth than that of the body. * * Suddenly he will behold a marvellous thing, beauty, in its very essence. * * This beauty, in the first place, is from everlasting, and knows neither beginning nor ending, neither growth nor decay.[2]

"Now, to go on, or to be led by another along the right way of love, is this: beginning from those lower

তেমতি নায়িকা হইলে রসিকা
হীন জাতি পুরুষেরে।
স্বভাব লওয়ায় স্বজাতি ধরায়
যেমন কাচ পোকা করে॥

Caṇḍidāsa's Song, No. 799.

[1] একেরে করিলে মর্ম্ম সবাকার জানি।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 15.

[2] রূপের ধারা বাউল পারা
বহিছে জগত আন্ধ।
রূপ রসে জগত ভাসে
এ চৌদ্দ ভুবন॥

Ibid, p. 48.

manifestations of the beautiful to go on in a continual ascent, all the way proposing this highest beauty as an end, and using the rest but as so many steps in the ascent,[1] to proceed from one to two, and from two to all beautiful forms, * * and thus finally learn to know what the very essence of beauty is.''

Thus, we find that a few centuries before Christ, Plato preached the philosophy of a doctrine relating to the culture of love, which in its chief characteristics resembles the Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal. The adoption of a female companion for mystic culture is now being held in disrepute by the cultured people and by the members of the other sects, but the philosophy underlying such adoption has been clearly set forth by Plato. When holding against the Sahajiyā faith, one must weigh carefully the wisdom of this great philosopher.. The way in which Plato has handled the subject leads us to believe that a doctrine similar to that advocated by the modern Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyās of Bengal was not unknown in Greece even at that remote past in a fully developed form. But Plato simply gives us the theory without entering into the details of how the doctrine was actually followed in practice, and how was the culture of love undertaken in order to transfer or translate it from the beauty of the body to the beauty of the soul, and from one soul to all. We may have a clear idea about this practical side of the culture from the Sahajiyās of the present day. Elsewhere we have given details of such culture

[1] রাগ সাধনের এমনি রীত।
সে পথি জনার যেমন চিত ॥
Caṇḍīdāsa's Song No. 786,

as is followed by the Sahajiyās, which will show how the philosophy of Plato is being followed in practice by the members of a religious sect of Bengal who know very little of that illustrious Greek philosopher and his works.

We thus find that both Prema Dās and Gaurī Dās were justified in making the statements which we have quoted at the beginning of this chapter, that the Sahajiyā doctrine was in existence in all ages and climes. Hereinbefore we have quoted evidences from the Vedas, the Upaniṣads and the earlier Buddhistic works, as well as from the Banquet of Plato and other Western sources, coming down to the history of various sects that were in existence even in the middle ages of Europe. We shall now return to the soil of India, and make a comparative study of the Sahajiyā doctrine, (*i*) with Tāntrikism, (*ii*) with the Buddhist Sahajiyā, and (*iii*) with the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā of the older type, and then deal with the history of the origin and development of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal.

II. Tāntrikism and Sahajiyā.

The mystic culture of the Tantras is of great antiquity, though it is not definitely known how old it is. It has certain features reminiscent of sex-worship, which may perhaps be the remnants of ancient culture of the primitive races of India, subsequently modified and improved in various ways. The Sahajiyā doctrine resembles Tāntrikism in many of its characteristics. Both of them advocate Parakīyā companion for mystic practices, and pay little heed to the orthodox view advocating the necessity of restraining the activities of senses for spiritual advancement. They do not allow themselves to be swayed away by the consideration of

castes in limiting their religious activities. "Look to the individual, and let him grow as a man in an atmosphere of freedom"—this seems to be the principle on which both the doctrines are based. It is no wonder, therefore, that there are marked similarities of thought that can be observed in these two doctrines. Moreover, the Sahajiyā works abound in expressions which seem to echo the sense of some of the passages of the Tantras, with this difference that what the Sahajiyās have borrowed they have moulded with the stamp of their own religion. We quote below to point out some of the similarities of this nature.

Association with women.

In dwelling on the necessity of taking female companions for mystic culture, the Tantras say—[1]

"No worship is valid without women (Śakti), fish and meat."

"If a devotee be engaged in worship without taking a Parakīyā companion, he will not be successful in his endeavour even by reciting the prayer hundred crores of times."

The following, quoted from the Sahajiyā works, seem to echo the sense expressed above :—

"If you do not submit yourself to a Mañjarī (woman) but simply rely on the theoretical knowledge of the thing, you cannot get Kṛṣṇa by spiritual culture."

"You should take to worship by being associated with a Mañjarī."[2]

[1] বিনা শক্তিং ন পূজাস্তি মৎস্যমাংসং বিনা প্রিয়ে।

And—বিনা পরক্রিয়া দেবি জপেদ্ যদি তু সাধকঃ।

শতকোটী-জপেনৈব তস্য সিদ্ধির্ন জায়তে॥

N.B.—Sanskrit quotations here and below are from the Viśvakoṣa.

"Perform mystic culture in the company of a Prakṛti (woman).[1]

The difference is that the Sahajiyās do not use fish or meat in mystic culture, but as regards the necessity of women (who are designated by them by the terms Mañjarīs, Prakṛtis or Sakhīs, but not by Śaktis as in the Tantras), they have the same idea of the utility of a female companion as preached in the Tantras.

The ideal of conjugal union.

In dealing with the higher aspect of the doctrine, the Tantras say that union with women need not be of physical character but one may as well adopt the principle and apply it for mental culture—" Verily one should practise in the mind union either with a Svakīyā or a Parakīyā woman."

" Everything should be practised in the mind and then only can success be attained." [2]

The Sahajiyās also speak in the same strain :—

" In the worship of Kṛṣṇa, one should practise Rati in the mind."

" The cravings for gross enjoyment should be subdued, and union should be sought in the mind only."

1 মঞ্জরি অনুগা বিনে বিষয়ের জ্ঞানে।
না পাইবে ভজিয়া সে শ্রীরাধারমনে॥

Rāgamayīkaṇā, p. 2.

মঞ্জরি আশ্রয় হয়া করিবে সেবন।

Rasasāra, p. 43.

প্রকৃতি লইয়া তার করহ সাধন।

Premānandalaharī, p. 9.

2 স্বকীয়াং পরকীয়াং বা মানসস্ত রমেৎ স্ত্রিয়ম্।
সর্ব্বস্ত মানসং কুর্য্যাত্তেন সিধ্যতি সাধকঃ॥

"The Sahajiyā culture should be pratised in the mind only."[1]

Here we find that both the doctrines stick to the ideal of mental culture at a certain stage of their growth. They believe in the evolution of sentiment for spiritual advancement, and have for this purpose adopted the most common ideal of the union of man and woman either in theory or in practice, as the means of entering into the sphere of mysteries affecting our individual existence, the solution of which opens the portals of right knowledge about self and its natural tendencies.

The Śiva Saṃhitā says that everything originated from the Spirit, so a man should take refuge in the Spirit by giving up all other pursuits.[2]

The undernoted verse of a Sahajiyā work named Rasaratnasāra is an exact translation of this verse.[3]

The Sahajiyā writers make no secret of this debt. In plain terms they say that they have borrowed from

1 মনেতে করহ রতি শ্রীরূপ পরাণ পতি
শ্রীকৃষ্ণ-ভজন কর সার।

Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 8.

নিজ সুখ নাহি মাত্র আত্মাতে রমণ।

Ratnasāra, p. 88.

সহজ ভজন মনে করহ সর্ব্বথা।

Rasasāra, p. 46.

2 চৈতন্যাৎ সর্ব্বমুৎপন্নং জগদেতচ্চরাচরম্।
তস্মাৎ সর্ব্বং পরিত্যজ্য চৈতন্যন্তু সমাশ্রয়েৎ॥

3 চৈতন্য হইতে সর্ব্ব হয় উৎপাদিত।
সর্ব্ব ত্যাগি চৈতন্যের আশ্রয় বিহিত॥

p. 22.

the Tāntric texts. They have also mentioned the names of the books which served them as guides.

References to Tāntric texts.

In the Āgama Grantha, the author, after preliminary invocations, proceeds by saying—"This book will deal with the subject treated in the mystic Śaiva Āgama, which was written in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvatī."[1]

The author of Rasaratnasāra writes:—"Narottama asked his Guru about the mode of spiritual culture. The Guru said—'Hear, Narottama, I am telling you what was written in the Śiva Saṃhitā by Śiva himself."[2]

In the Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, the writer says:—"Know it for certain that I have written here what I found described in the preliminary verses of the book named Āgamasāra."[3]

In the Ratnasāra, the author undoubtedly refers to the Tantras when he says that spiritual success based on Parakīyā culture is supported by the Śāstras.[4]

In the Amṛtarasāvalī, the author thus refers to the Tāntric doctrine—"He (Bharata) wrote about himself in the preliminary verses of the book named Āgamasāra. Any one desirous of knowing it, can do so by consulting

1 শিব রহস্যাগমে যে কথা শুনিল।
পার্ব্বতিরে সদাশিব যে কথা কহিল॥ p. 1.

2 কি রূপ সে সাধনের পন্থা কহ স্বামি॥
শুন নরোত্তম তবে সেই তত্ত্ব কথা।
শিব সংহিতায় শিব প্রকাশিল যাহা॥ p. 20.

3 আগমসার মঙ্গলাচরণে কয়।
সে পয়ার লিখিলাম জানিবে নিশ্চয়॥
p. 14.

4 পরকিয়া ভাবে সিদ্ধ আছে শাস্ত্রযুক্তি।
P. 4.

that book. It was composed in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvatī."[1]

It will thus be quite clear that the Sahajiyā writers have acknowledged their indebtedness to Tāntrikism in clear terms. They have also adopted the nerve and lotus theory of the Tantras with slight modifications to serve their own purpose. Sahajiyā works like the Amṛtaratnāvalī, Dehanirṇaya, and Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī deal elaborately with the positions of nerves, lotuses and ponds. The Rāgātmikā *padas* which are passing in the name of Caṇḍīdāsa, some of which have been printed towards the end of Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī published by the Bangiya Sāhitya Pariṣad, supply proofs of adoption from the Tantras. These *padas* give expositions to the Sahajiyā doctrine, lending a poetic charm to a complicated theology. In dealing with these matters we must have occasion to refer to the ṣaṭcakra theory of the Tantras which is too well-known to require explanation here.

The nerve and lotus theory.

The Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī locates seven *Sarovaras* or *ponds* in the human body, thus :—At the navel there is the navel pond wherein is situated the Jaḍa lotus. On the head is the Akṣaya pond with a lotus of thousand petals. Below this, there is the Kaṇṭha pond with a lotus of four petals. Then comes the Kṣīra pond in the breast with a lotus of eight petals. Māna pond

[1] আপনার তত্ত্ব তিঁহ লেখেন আপনে।
আগমসার গ্রন্থের মঙ্গলাচরণে ॥
তার তত্ত্ব শুনিতে যদি কার লোভ হয়।
আগমসার দেখিলে পাবে তাহার নির্ণয় ॥
শিবদুর্গার বাক্য লয়া কর্য়াছে বর্ণন।

P. 19.

is located in the abdomen with a lotus of hundred petals. Then there is the Pṛthu pond near about the navel (perhaps separated from the Navel pond) with a lotus of six petals. Ghora pond is at the private part of the body with a lotus of two petals. These six with the Jaḍa lotus noted above, make up seven lotuses."[1]

We shall now see how six *cakras* have been located within the human body in the Tantras—" Mūlādhāra is a triangular space in the midmost part of the body. It is described as a red lotus of four petals, situated between the base of the sexual organ and the anus. Svādhiṣṭhāna is a six-petalled lotus at the base of the sexual organ above Mūlādhāra and below the navel. Maṇipura is at the navel, it has ten petals. Anāhata is at the breast, it has twelve petals. Viśuddha is at the neck with sixteen petals, while Ājñā is at the brow with two petals. Above all is Sahasrāra with thousand petals."

[1] নাভিস্থানে নাভি সরোবর জড়পদ্ম তায় ॥
মস্তকে অক্ষয় সরোবর সহস্রদল ইথে ।
তার নিচে কণ্ঠসরোবর জানিবে নিশ্চিতে ॥
চতুর্দ্দল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চয় ।
হৃদয় ভিতরে ক্ষীরসরোবর হয় ॥
অষ্টদল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চয় ॥
উদর ভিতরে মানসরোবর কয় ।
শতদল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চয় ॥
পৃথু নাভির নাম পৃথু সরোবর ।
ষড়্দল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নির্দ্ধার ॥
ঘোর সরোবর হয় নির্জ্জন স্থানেতে ।
দুই দল পদ্ম ইথে জানিবে নিশ্চিতে ॥
ছয় পদ্ম এক জড় সপ্ত এই কয় ।

P. 13.

It should be observed that the *ponds* of the Sahajiyās, and the *cakras* of the Tantras are all seven in number. The Sahajiyās have introduced some modifications in the number of petals which the lotuses possess. Moreover, they have changed the position of some of them: two have been placed near about the navel, while the place of the Ājñā has been kept vacant, and a new lotus of the Māna pond has been introduced in the abdomen. But from the description given above, it is quite evident that the Sahajiyās have copied from the Tāntric texts with certain modifications to suit their own purpose.

Now, about the nerve system. According to the Psycho-physiological theory of the Tantras there are as many as three and a half crores of nerves in the human body. Of these, the principal are fourteen, and of these Iḍā, Piṅgalā, and Suṣumnā are the chief, of which again Suṣumnā is the first in importance. Other nerves are called Gāndhārī, Kuhu, Sarasvati, Pusā,[1] etc. But according to the Toḍala Tantra, there are only eleven nerves which are considered important. There is thus difference of opinion among the Tāntric authors as to the number of the important nerves.

The Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, however, gives prominence to thirty-two nerves which are thus named in that book—Śūnyā, Diptā, Kiraṇa, Dhīra, Rati, Tāmra, Kānti, Ujjvala, Kamvu, Daraśana, Lakṣavāṇa, Sārāsāra, Suvasa,

[1] সার্দ্ধলক্ষত্রয়ো নাড্যাঃ সন্তি দেহান্তরে নৃণাম্ ।
প্রধানভূতা নাড্যস্তু তাসু মুখ্যাশ্চতুর্দ্দশ ॥ etc.

শিবসংহিতা ।

Subhadra, etc.[1] Four of them are said to be of special importance in mystic culture.[2] It is said that all other nerves originate from them. Animals take their birth from the nerve which has the colour of the sun. From the nerve named Garbhodakaśāyī originate those beings who are accustomed to the Svakīyā mode of worship. From the Kṣīrodaśāyī nerve are born those who are the worshippers of Kṛṣṇa, while the Candraśāyī nerve produces the Sahajiyās, who are bent upon the culture of love.

This sort of differentiation of the nerves producing different kinds of beings is somewhat original and shows the tendency of some Sahajiyā writers to create a peculiar nerve theory suited to their own purpose, on the model of the Tāntric texts. On the other hand, Caṇḍīdāsa

[1] শুক্ল নাড়ী শুক্ল কুঠি এই নাম কয়।
দীপ্ত কুঠি দীপ্ত নাড়ী আছয়ে শরীরে।
কিরণ কুঠি কিরণ নাড়ী রজগুনে স্থিতি।
ধীর কুঠি ধীর নাড়ী তমগুণে স্থিতি।
হিঙ্গুলা কুঠি হিঙ্গুলা নাড়ী জানিবে নিশ্চয়ে।
রতি কুঠি রতি নাড়ী অধরামৃত পানে॥ etc.
p. 10.

[2] আর চারি নাড়ী যে প্রধান বস্তু হয়।
এই চারি হৈতে সব নাড়ী নিশ্চয়॥
অরুণ বর্ণ নাড়ী তাতে মূত্র নাড়ী হয়।
পশুগণের মূত্র নাড়ীতে জন্ম নিশ্চয়॥
গর্ভোদকশায়ী মনের নাড়ী হয়।
সৃষ্টি আদি স্বকীয়ার জন্ম ইথে হয়॥
ক্ষিরোদশায়ী নাড়ী সকলের সার।
কৃষ্ণভক্ত ভক্তগণের ইহাতে নির্দ্ধার॥
চন্দ্রশায়ী নাড়ী হয় সবার উত্তম।
চৈতন্যরূপা রসিকভক্তের ইহাতে জনম॥
p. 11.

has been more faithful to the Tantras in his Rāgātmikā *padas*. About the lotuses he says—

"How wonderful is the creation of the Great Creator! He has located six lotuses within the human body. The Sahasrāra is a lotus of thousand petals (at the head), below which is Maṇipura wherein resides the great Śiva. At the base of the nose there is a two-petalled lotus looking like the twin eyes of the bird *khañjana*. In the throat is placed a lotus with sixteen petals, whereas in the region of the heart there is a lotus with hundred petals. At the navel is Kulakuṇḍalinī with ten petals, and a little below is the Prema Pond wherein is situated a lotus with eight petals."[1]

In this description, Maṇipura has been placed in the head somewhere above the base of the nose, but in the Tantras it is located at the navel. Kulakuṇḍalinī has also been placed in the position of the Maṇipura of the Tantras. The lotus of the breast is here spoken of as a flower with hundred petals, whereas the Tantras make it a twelve-petalled one. In the following description, however, Caṇḍīdāsa is more faithful to the Tantras.

[1] কিবা কারিকরের আজ্ঞা কারিকুরি।
তার মধ্যে ছয় পদ্ম রাখিয়াছে পুরি॥
সহস্রারে হয় পদ্ম সহস্রেক দল।
তার তলে মণিপুর পরম শিবের স্থল॥
নাসামূলে দ্বিদল পদ্ম খঞ্জনাক্ষি।
কণ্ঠে গাঁথি ষোড়শ দল পদ্ম দিল রাখি॥
হৃৎপদ্ম নির্ম্মিত আছে শতদলে।
কুলকুণ্ডলিনী দশদল হয় নাভীমূলে॥
নাভির নিম্নভাগে প্রেম সরোবর।
অষ্টদল পদ্ম হয় তাহার ভিতর॥

Song No. 813.

"According to another version, there is a thousand-petalled lotus in the head. Between the eye-brows is situated a lotus with two petals, while that at the neck is a sixteen-petalled one. The lotus of the heart has twelve petals, and that of the navel, ten only. At the base of the generative organ there is a lotus with six petals, whereas that at the anus has fourteen petals."[1]

In describing the nerve system, the Tāntric ideal seems to have been imitated in the Rāgātmikā *padas*. "The six *Cakras* are fixed in the cerebro-spinal axis which is the main support of all. It has Iḍā and Piṅgalā on two sides, with the nerve Suṣumnā in the middle."[2] The Tantras say—"Suṣumnā is in the hollow of the Meru in the cerebro-spinal axis. It extends from the

[1] মতান্তরে যে কহয়ে শুনহ নিশ্চয়।
মস্তক উপরে সহস্রদল পদ্ম হয়॥
ভ্রূমধ্যে দ্বিদল, কণ্ঠে ষোলদল।
হৃদি মধ্যে দ্বাদশ, নাভিমূলে দশদল॥
লিঙ্গ মূলে ষড়্দল, চতুর্দ্দশ গুহ্যমূলে।

Song No. 814.

N. B.—Here in the number of petals of the lotus situated near anus the Sahajiyā literature and the Tāntrik texts do not agree. But it seems that this difference is simply due to misreading. The word চতুর্দ্দশ should be read as চতুর্দ্দল (four-petalled), as we have it in another song thus—

গুহ্যমূলে চতুর্দ্দল পদ্ম বিরাজিত।

Song No. 813.

[2] ষটচক্রের মূল মৃণাল হয় মেরুদণ্ড।
শিরসি পর্য্যন্ত সে ভেদ করি অণ্ড॥
দণ্ড দুই পার্শ্বেতে ঈড়া পিঙ্গলা রহে।
মধ্যস্থিত সুষুম্না সদা প্রবল বহে॥

Song No. 813.

Mūlādhāra lotus to the cerebral region. * * The various lotuses in the different *Cakras* of the body are all suspended from the Citrā-Nāḍī, the *Cakras* being described as knots in the Nāḍī, which is as thin as the thousandth part of a hair. Outside the Meru and on each side of the Sushumnā are the Nāḍis Iḍā and Piṅgalā, etc.'' (From the rendering of Arthur Avalon.)

But here also in the conception of lotuses, the Sahajiyās have introduced their own peculiarities in other ways. In the Rāgātmikā *padas* of Caṇḍīdāsa it is maintained that "among the devotees, those who are in the Pravarta stage should adopt the lotus of the region of heart, those who are in the Sādhaka stage should take to the lotus of the navel, but the men of the Siddha stage should stick to the thousand-petalled lotus, the Rati being cultured in the Prema Pond where is a lotus of eight petals."[1] This way of dealing with the lotuses according to the stages of culture is particularly Sahajiyā in character. Caṇḍīdāsa also admits this in Song No. 814 of the anthology of his *padas* published by the Baṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad. While dealing with a particular kind of arrangement of the lotuses, he says that "it is in no way connected with the mystic culture of the Sahajiyās. It is verily connected with the Vaidhī mode of culture, but not with the Rāgānugā mode followed by the Sahajiyās."[2]

[1] প্রবর্ত্ত সাধক হৃদ্-নাভি পদ্মের আশ্রয় ।
সিদ্ধার্থ সহস্রারে আছয়ে নিশ্চয় ॥
রতি স্থির প্রেম সরোবর অষ্ট দলে ।
সাধনের মূল এই চণ্ডীদাস বলে ॥

Song No. 813.

[2] সাধন তত্ত্বে তার যোগ নাহি হয় ।
বৈধী যোগ এই তত্ত্বে হয়ত নিশ্চয় ॥

Ibid, No. 814.

There are many other points of agreement that can be observed in the two doctrines.

In the sphere of practical culture, the Sahajiyās say that the worshipper should not follow the Dakṣiṇā course, but should stick to the Vāmā mode.[1] In the Tantras also it is said that the Vāmā is better than the Dakṣiṇā, for the latter is practically based on the Vedic principles,[2] and hence it falls within the sphere of the Vaidhī Culture which is also denounced by the Sahajiyās, because they prefer the Rāgānugā mode.

In the Tāntrik Vāmācāra mode of culture the devotees should adopt the nature of a woman,[3] an idea which is also the basic principle of the Sahajiyā culture.[4]

[1] দক্ষিণ দেশেতে না যাবে কদাচিতে
যাইলে প্রমাদ হবে।
Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī (P. E.), Song No. 764.

বামা রাগ হয় অতি রসের উল্লাস।
দক্ষিণা রাগেতে হয় যথাযোগ্য বিলাস॥
Ratnasāra, p. 91.

দক্ষিণেতে কাম হয়, বামে নেত্র প্রেম।
Ātmānirūpaṇa, p. 3.

দক্ষিণাদুত্তমং বামং।
Kulārṇava-Tantra.

দক্ষিণাচারতন্ত্রোক্তং কর্ম্ম তচ্ছুদ্ধবৈদিকম্।
বামাচারো ভবেত্তত্র বামা ভূত্বা যজেৎ পরাম্॥
Ācārabheda-Tantra.

আপনি পুরুষ প্রকৃতি হইবে, etc.
Rasasāra, p. 47.

প্রকৃতি হইয়া করে প্রকৃতি সেবন।
Nigūḍhārtha-Prak., p. 4.

We have seen that the Sahajiyās advocate the company of beautiful women in mystic culture, and that an idea similar to this is also prevalent in Tāntrikism.[1] In the last chapter we have given details of such culture as observed by the Sahajiyās in the company of women. What is practically done in the Vāmācāra system of the Tantras is somewhat like this in practice, with this characteristic difference that the Tantras advocate the use of fish, meat and wine,[2] while the Sahajiyās do not take to any such thing. It should also be noted here that the Tāntrics by taking Parakīyā women follow a sort of mechanical culture which has much less to do with love, but the Sahajiyās adopt Parakīyā for the culture of love, beauty and bliss. With the Tāntrics, worship of and communication with women is a matter of mere form, there being not much emotional touch in it, but with the Sahajiyās it is primarily connected with the culture of the heart. The peculiarities of these two doctrines will be quite evident from the names their followers have given to female companions. The Tāntrics are the worshippers of Power and Will, and so they call women as Śaktis, but the Sahajiyās are the followers of love, and so they use the terms Mañjarīs or Sakhīs to designate their female partners. Though there are agreements in customs and practices, the spirit of these two doctrines is quite different from each other.

1 লজ্জালাঞ্ছিতভালা যা সা সাক্ষাদ্ ভুবনেশ্বরী ।
নানা জাত্যুদ্ভবানাঞ্চ সা দীক্ষা কুলপূজনে ॥
Niruttara-Tantra, Chap. II.

2 পঞ্চতত্ত্বং খপুষ্পঞ্চ পূজয়েৎ কুলযোষিতম্ ।
Ācārabheda-Tantra.

We have thus dealt with some of the chief characteristics of the Sahajiyā doctrine and Tāntrikism, and have pointed out that there are striking similarities in many respects. In fact, it appears to us that Tāntrikism is not a separate cult ; it is rather an aspect of religion which had its origin in the spontaneous growth of the human mind.[1] As no religion can ignore such a force, Tāntrikism crept into the fold of almost every religion in some form or other at a certain stage of its growth. We should rather say that the common people coming within the influence of the refined philosophical doctrines of religious teachers, did not forsake their own favourite religion, but adopted it with certain modifications according to the necessity of the time. On the other hand, whoever came to preach a new faith among the common people, was confronted with the impossible task of changing the popular beliefs. The old materials were, therefore, kept undisturbed as far as possible, with simply a new moulding according to new light. This is the reason why we have Tāntric touch in Śaivism, Vaiṣṇavism, Buddhism, as well as among the followers of other religions, as we have pointed out in course of our discussions on the subject of ancient sex-worship.

III. The Buddhist Sahajiyā.

We are now coming to a point which is nearer to our mark, and so within the range of our distinct vision. Dr. H. P. Śāstrī maintains that the saint Lui preached the Sahajiyā doctrine among the Buddhists in the 9th

1 শাস্ত্র যুক্তি মানে নাই রাগানুগা ধর্ম্ম।
লোকেতে উৎকীর্ণ ভাব, এই তার মর্ম্ম॥

Ratnasāra, p. 80.

century A. D.[1] From the record of numerous Sanskrit and (as they are called) Bengali works that had been translated in the Tibetan language, we find that the current of the Buddhist Sahajiyā doctrine had a continuous flow from this time upto the 13th century A. D.[2] Now, this is the period which immediately precedes that of the modern Vaiṣṇava-Sahajiyā activity of Bengal, and hence we are greatly interested in the doctrine of the Buddhist Sahajiyās. By his discovery and publication of some rare manuscripts under the title of the Bauddha Gāna and Dohā, Dr. Śāstrī has brought to light valuable materials which may be profitably utilised for a comparative study of religions, specially of the Sahajiyā doctrine with which we are concerned here. In his introduction to that useful publication he has noted down some prominent characteristics of the Buddhist Sahajiyā cult, and we give below a brief summary of some of the most important points touched by him, as well as other features of the doctrine as can be gathered from the body of the text.

I. The character of the Sahajānanda conceived by the Buddhist Sahajiyās, is of the nature of the bliss arising out of conjugal union, otherwise symbolically expressed as the union of the thunderbolt and the lotus.[3] The

[1] তবে দাঁড়াইল এই যে, খ্রীষ্টীয় ৯ শতাব্দীতে বৌদ্ধদিগের মধ্যে লুই সহজ ধর্ম্ম প্রচার করেন। B. G. and Dohā, Introd., p. 16.

[2] তাহা হইলে এই বাঙ্গালা বহিগুলি ৭ শত হইতে ১৩ শতের মধ্যে লেখা হইয়াছিল ও তর্জ্জমা হইয়াছিল। খ্রীষ্টীয় ৮।৯।১০।১১।১২ শতে এই সকল বহিগুলি লেখা হইয়াছিল বলা যায়। *Ibid*, p. 6.

[3] "যুগনদ্ধরূপং সহজানন্দফলং," and "কুলিশারবিন্দসংযোগাক্ষরসুখোপায়ং"।
B. G. and Dohā (Text), pp. 2-3 (notes).

modern Sahajiyā cult based on Madhura Bhāva is also conceived on this ideal, both in theory and practice.[1]

II. The Buddhist Sahajiyās do not acknowledge the authority of the Vedas, and the utility of the sacrifices.[2] The rituals of the orthodox school are generally ignored in the mystic religions. The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (1-2-7), the Kaṭha-Upaniṣad (2-10), the Gītā (9-20-22), do not attach much value to the usefulness of sacrificial observances when they speak of absolute spiritual emancipation. The Vaiṣṇava-Sahajiyās also hold fast to similar views, for they have their teachings always directed against the observances of the Vedic rites.[3]

1 উজ্জ্বল মধুর রস শৃঙ্গার সম্ভোগ।
প্রেম পরিপূর্ণ দোহার রসের সংযোগ॥

Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 2.

2 সুতরাং বেদেরই প্রামাণ্য নাই। হোম করিলে মুক্তি যত হোক না হোক, ধোয়ায় চক্ষের পীড়া হয় এই মাত্র। B. G. and Dohā, Introd., pp. 6-7.

Also

অকৃখি উহাবিঅ কড়্এ ধুমেঁমিতি।

Ibid, Text, p. 82.

N. B.—An idea similar to this is also expressed in the Cārvāka-Darśana.

3 ছাড়ি জপ তপ করহ আরোপ
একতা করিয়া মনে।

Caṇḍīdāsa's Song No. 764.

রাজযোগ সিদ্ধ কাম সহজেতে নয়।

Rasaratnasāra, p. 31.

বেদ বিধি ছাড়া হয় প্রেমের ভকতি।

Vṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā, p. 7.

ভকত ভজন করে নিজ অঙ্গ দিয়া।
বেদধর্ম্ম ভক্তিযোগ সর্ব্বত্যাগী হৈয়া॥

Ratnasāra, p. 17.

III. The Buddhist Sahajiyās have no faith in the existence of God.[1] Though the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyās do not usually go so far in this respect, yet they maintain that man in potentiality is superior to God. The statements like—"God can never be equal to man," "God can never know the secrets of human nature," "God can never adopt the nature of man,"[2] are abundant in Sahajiyā literature. Caṇḍīdāsa in his mystic songs maintains that man is superior to all, there being nothing greater than him." In fact, the

বেদ-বিধি পায় এমন আচার
যাজন করিবে যে।
ব্রজের নিত্যধন পায় সেই জন
তাহার উপরে কে।

Caṇḍīdāsa's Song, No. 781.

1 কিন্তু যখন কোন পদার্থই নাই, যখন বস্তুই বস্তু নয়, তখন ঈশ্বরও ত বস্তু, তিনি কেমন করিয়া থাকেন। B. G. and Dohā, Introd., p. 7.

Also তদা চ বস্তু ন বস্তু। কথমীশ্বর ইত্যতে সিদ্ধ্যতি।

Ibid, Text, p. 85(n.).

2 ঈশ্বর না হয় কভু জীবের সমান।

Ratnasāra, p. 40.

ঈশ্বর মানুষের তত্ত্ব লইতে নারিবে।

Rasatattvasāra, p. 17.

ঈশ্বর মানুষ ভাব কভু নাহি পায়।
পুনঃ পুনঃ ফুকারিয়া গ্রন্থকার কয়॥

Ratnasāra, p. 5.

3 শুনহে মানুষ ভাই,
সবার উপর মানুষ সত্য
তাহার উপর নাই॥

Song No. 809.

Sahajiyās have so greatly magnified the importance of man that the idea of Godhead has fallen in the background.

IV. Tāntrikism, as we have said before, is a popular cult which has forced itself within the fold of other religions. In the Buddhist Sahajiyā system also there was a current marked with the peculiarities of Tāntrikism. The Dākārṇava Tantra incorporated in the Bauddha Gān and Dohā, and some of the Caryyā *padas* deal with this aspect of the doctrine. The ideas of *nerves*, *cakras*, *yoginīs*, etc., have been elaborated in this system,[1] and they manifest peculiar mysticism which is the common characteristic of all the Tantras, Hindu, Bauddha and the Vaiṣṇava.

V. Another common characteristic of the mystic religions is present both in the Buddhist and the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā doctrines. It is the Guru's advice that is there held as the most valuable guide for spiritual advancement. As the religion is of mystic nature, one cannot enter into the secrets of mysticism without the help of one who has a thorough knowledge of the subject. The Buddhist Dohās maintain that the secrets of the Sahajiyā doctrine are to be learnt from the Gurus, and that utmost reverence should be paid to them, for they are even superior to Buddha.[2] In the

[1] নাড়ি শক্তি দিট ধরিঅ খট্টে,
অধরাত্তি ভর. কমল বিকসউ।
বত্তিস জোইণী তসু অঙ্গ উহ্লসিউ। etc.

B. G. and Dohā, pp. 21, 42, etc.

[2] সহজ পন্থা গুরুর মুখে শুনিতে হয়। দোঁহাগুলিতে গুরুর উপর ভক্তি করিতে বড়ই উপদেশ দেয়। গুরু বুদ্ধের অপেক্ষাও বড়।

B. G. and Dohā, Introd., pp. 6-7.

Also গুরুবঅণে দিঢ় ভক্তি করু হই হই সহজ উল্লাসু। etc.

Ibid, Text, p. 103, also pp. 96, 97, etc.

Upaniṣads there are frequent references to learners' going to the Gurus for being instructed in the knowledge of the Brahma-Vidyā.[1] In the Gītā also (4-34, 13-26, etc.) the Guru's advice is held out as a valuable means of effecting spiritual advancement. In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, the Guru is said to be the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa.[2] Among the Sahajiyā works, the Amṛtaratnāvalī says that spiritual progress depends upon the advice of the Guru.[3] The Rasasāra identifies the Guru with Kṛṣṇa in the sphere of love, and the Ātmatattva Grantha holds fast to a similar view.[4] There is, therefore, perfect agreement of thought in the literature of all these mystic doctrines on this point.

VI. The Buddhist Sahajiyās attach much importance to the knowledge of human nature. They also maintain that there is no difference between self and the rest of the world, and that the apparent differences are merely physical, and not essential.[5] Passages of a similar import

[1] Kaṭha Up. (The story of Naciketā); Praśna Up. (the story of Pippalāda); Muṇḍaka Up. (Chap. I); Chhānd. Up. (Canto 4, Chap. 4, etc.), etc.

[2] শিক্ষাগুরু হন কৃষ্ণ মহান্ত স্বরূপে। Canto I, Chap. 1.

[3] গুরু আজ্ঞা পালন করিবে নিজ মনে।
তার আজ্ঞা অনুসারে হবে ভাবাশ্রয় ॥ p. 1.

[4] শ্রীকৃষ্ণ হয়েন গুরু প্রেমের আলয়। Rasasāra, p. 3.

And তিনি কে, শ্রীশ্রীগুরু ; শ্রীগুরুর উপর আর কেহ নাই।
Ātmatattva Grantha, p. 3.

[5] মানুষ আপনার স্বভাবটাই বুঝে না।
আপনি ও পর, এ ভ্রান্তি করিও না।
(দুই এক); সকলই নিরন্তর বুদ্ধ।
B. G. and Dohā, Intro., p. 8.
Also the Text, p. 119.

are also found in the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā literature, and the idea of unity in all objects of nature is a pet theory with the Sahajiyās of Bengal.[1]

VII. In the Vajrayāna doctrine established mainly on the principle of the enjoyment of joy,[2] female companion is advocated for the sake of Ānanda or Bliss. Dr. H. P. Śāstrī has brought with him from Nepāl a portion of a commentary, copied by him, of the Caṇḍaroṣaṇa-Mahātantra which is a valuable work to the followers of the Vajrayāna cult. From this book (*vide* the Viśvakoṣa, Vol. XXI, pp. 346-7) we know that mystic culture in the company of women advocated by this sect, was somewhat similar to that practised by the modern Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyās, the details of which we have given in Chapter II, above.

To go into further minute details of comparison is not our object in this place, but from what we have stated before, it is not difficult to find out that both in thought and practice there is perfect agreement between the Buddhist and the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā doctrines on certain important points. Yet the difference between

[1] সকলের সার হয় আপন শরীর ।

Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 3.

আপনা জানিলে তবে সহজ বস্তু জানে ।

U. M. No. 611, p. 4.

সমস্ত জগত যদি আত্মরূপ হয় ।

Rasaratnasāra, p. 38.

সহজে অভেদ ভাবে দেখে যে অধীন ।

Ibid, p. 6.

[2] পঞ্চ কামান্ পরিত্যজ্য তপোভির্ন চ পীড়য়েৎ ।
সুখেন সাধয়েদ্ বোধিং যোগতন্ত্রানুসারতঃ ॥

B. G. and Dohā, Text, p 4.

them is also as wide as the poles. From what we learn from the Bauddha Gān and Dohā, we find that the doctrine treated therein is a dry philosophical one, mainly based on the principle of acquiring spiritual knowledge by the exercise of intellectual faculties. The passages like কাআ তরুবর পঞ্চ বি ডাল (This body is like a tree with five branches), পর অপ্পাণ ম ভক্তি করু সঅল নিরন্তর বুদ্ধ (Do not make a distinction between self and others, etc.), have been treated in such a manner that we get there food more for the brain than for the heart, whereas the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyās have dealt with similar sentiments on the background of love, making love, but not wisdom, the primary object of culture. In the Buddhist Sahajiyā system there are three main currents of thought—(*i*) Avadhūtī, which is dualistic, (*ii*) Caṇḍālī, where dualism merges into non-dualism, and (*iii*) Baṅgālī or Dombī, which is purely non-dualistic in character.[1] These are abstract speculations wherein intellectual faculties are churned for the cream of wisdom. In a system like this, love cannot play an important part, and it is principally in this respect that the modern Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyās differ from the Buddhist Sahajiyās.

Inspite of this characteristic difference in the essence of the two faiths, we have a number of points, as we have shown above, on which the Buddhist and the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyās are of the same persuasion. We thus find that there was among the Buddhists a sect

[1] সহজ মতে তিনটী পথ আছে ;—অবধূতী, চণ্ডালী, ডোম্বী বা বঙ্গালী। অবধূতীতে দ্বৈতজ্ঞান থাকে, চণ্ডালীতে দ্বৈতজ্ঞান আছে বলিলেও হয়, না বলিলেও হয়, কিন্তু ডোম্বীতে কেবল অদ্বৈত, দ্বৈতের ভাঁজও নাই। B. G. and Dohā, Introd., p. 12. Also *vide* Dohās, 10, 14, 18 and 19, etc.

following the Sahajiyā doctrine which in many of its characteristics resembled the modern Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal. In the long list of books appended to the Bauddha Gān and Dohā, there are many which were written about this mystic cult. From this we can guess that the doctrine was well-established in the Buddhist community from the 9th to the 13th century A. D.[1] We may get occasional references to the Sahajiyā doctrine in the literature of other sects, but these books are the only specimens of ancient Sahajiyā literature of which we know anything. Unfortunately, most of them are not available in printed form, but the publication of the Bauddha Gān and Dohā has given us at least a glimpse of that vast treasure which otherwise would have remained unknown to many of us.

IV. The Pre-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā.

Hereinbefore we have dealt with some of the important characteristics of Tāntrikism (which may conveniently be called the Śaiva Sahajiyā Cult, for the custom of taking female companion in mystic culture), and of the Buddhist Sahajiyā doctrine, on the basis of a comparative study with the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal, but there was also a Vaiṣṇava faith of the Sahajiyā tendency, the existence of which can be traced at least from the pre-Śaṅkarācāryya period. It was a pure doctrine embodying some of the highest truths of spirituality, and free from the grossness (as it is called) of Tāntrikism. As most of the references quoted below are of Vaiṣṇava complexion, we have conveniently named this new current as the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā doctrine for the sake of differentiation.

[1] B. G. and Dohā, Introd., p. 6.

In the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa we have references to the Sahaja-Siddhi, thus :—

প্রজাস্তা ব্রহ্মণা সৃষ্টাশ্চাতুর্ব্বর্ণ্যব্যবস্থিতৌ ।
সম্যক্‌শ্রদ্ধাসমাচার-প্রবণা মুনিসত্তম ॥
যথেচ্ছাবাসনিরতাঃ সর্ব্ববাধাবিবর্জ্জিতাঃ ।
শুদ্ধান্তঃকরণাঃ শুদ্ধাঃ সর্ব্বানুষ্ঠাননির্ম্মলাঃ ॥

1.6.11-12.

Herein is described the nature of men who were first created by Brahmā, the Supreme Creator. They were full of devotion, free to live wherever they liked, free from all obstacles, pure at heart, and of blameless action. This reminds us of the description of Adam and Eve living in the Paradise, who were also pure in thought and action, and full of devotion to God, before they tasted the fruits of the forbidden tree. In fact, the Bible here supplies us with a good illustration of the nature of the natural religion of man.

Then crept in sin, in consequence of which they lost *Sahaja Siddhi* as well as other Siddhis of eight kinds which were based on love and joy, etc.—

ততঃ সা সহজা সিদ্ধিস্তেষাং নাতীব জায়তে ।
রসোল্লাসাদয়শ্চান্যাঃ সিদ্ধয়োঽষ্টৌ ভবন্তি যাঃ ॥

1-6-16.

We thus find that there was a conception about the characteristics of persons who were qualified for Sahaja Sidddhi in that remote age. The same work further states :—

যানি কিম্পুরুষাদীনি বর্ষাণ্যষ্টৌ মহামুনে।
তেষাং স্বাভাবিকী সিদ্ধিঃ সুখপ্রায়া হ্যযত্নতঃ ॥
বিপর্য্যয়ো ন তেষ্বস্তি জরামৃত্যুভয়ং ন চ ।
ধর্ম্মাধর্ম্মৌ ন তেষ্বাস্তাং নোত্তমাধমমধ্যমাঃ ॥

2/1/25-26.

Here it is said that in certain parts of the world there exists Svābhāvikī (a synonym of Sahaja) Siddhi where joy depends not on efforts, and where there is no disease or death. The differentiation of sin and merit, of the high and the low is not observed in those places. In the higher aspect of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal, about which we shall speak in the next chapter there is also a conception about the characteristics of the ideal Sahaja man which is exactly of this nature. What is particularly noteworthy in this conception is that there is an atmosphere of perfect freedom in which man can move, depending upon what is thought to be his unerring natural tendency, without being circumscribed in the least by the conventional dogmas of religion and social usages. The Viṣṇu-Purāṇa was composed in the 4th century A D. at the latest,[1] and we have here a reference to the Sahaja-Siddhi as conceived in that remote age.

In the Fourth Oriental Conference held at Allababad in 1926, there was a paper read on the subject of Nāyaka-Nāyikābhāva in South Indian religion, the summary of which only is available to us. It says—"In the religion of the Śrī Vaiṣṇavism as developed in the Tamil Prabandhas of the Ālvārs, a special form of love which God bears to the soul is expounded. This love is called conjugal love metaphorically. This is almost the same as that expounded by the philosopher Caitanya in Northern India, except for the former being Viśiṣṭādvaita. Long before Caitanya and Vallabhācbārya, Saints Śaṭhagopa (Nammālvār), Parakala (Tirumangal Ālvār) and others developed the idea in their works

[1] Dynasties of the Kali Age, by F. E. Pargiter, Introd., pp. xii-xiii.

like the Tiruvaymoli and the Pirumoli. The famous Vedanta Desika * * refers to this idea in his Godastuti. He says that the Gurus of Goda, *i.e.*, the Ālvārs, in trying to enjoy God, convert their devotion to him into conjugal love, and console their hearts by stories of separation, etc., the author of the Drāviḍopanishatsaṃgati referring to this very sentiment. This sentiment of love towards God expressed in terms of conjugal love is best expressed in the works of Nammālvār 'Śarī Saṭhagopa,' the most important of the Ālvārs. It is said that Nammālvār enjoyed with references to God respectively all the various sentiments which Bharata, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā enjoyed towards Rāma, and the Gopīs with Kṛṣṇa, the divine shepherd, taking that manhood was befitting only to God, before whom the whole universe is like a woman.[1] Sathari in his great love for him assumed the shape of a woman. The great love which the worldly people cherish towards the worldly things, the same is called Bhakti when directed to Achyuta by the wise.[2] While describing the progress of this love of God, Nammālvār describes three states, (*i*) of playmate, (*ii*) of a mother, and (*iii*) of a

1 এক বহি আর পুরুষ নাহিক
সেই সে মানুষ সার।

Rasasāra, p. 47.

শ্রীকৃষ্ণ সভার পতি আর সব প্রকৃতি
এই কথা না বুঝয়ে কেহ।

Caitanya-Maṅgala, by Locana Dās, p, 242.

2 This is the basis of the Mādhuryya Bhāva as conceived by the Bengali Vaiṣṇavas, about which we shall speak later on in details.

young maiden who does not care for the obstacles, and breaking all of them asunder seeks to meet the Lord."[1]

The writer concludes with the following remarks :--
"The Nāyaka-Nāyikābhāva of the Tamil Vaiṣṇavas should have been very familiar to Śrī Śaṅkarāchārya who appears to allude to it once in his commentary of the Bhagavadgītā. While commenting on verse 44 of Canto XI, commenting on প্রিয়ঃ প্রিয়ায় here Saṅkara thinks that the form প্রিয়ায় is Ārṣa, and should be প্রিয়ায়ঃ which is not admissible grammatically, and wantonly introduces the idea of Nāyaka and Nāyikā, although there was no textual justification for the procedure. He should have been very familiar with this idea in the religion of South India at his period as it is developed in the works of the Saints Śaṭhagopa and Parakala." (pp. 194-98.)

We have here particulars of a doctrine which was similar to that of the Vaiṣṇavas of the post-Caitanya period (the Sahajiyās included) in many of its chief characteristics, and we have also proofs of its existence, as the writer has pointed out, in the pre-Śaṅkarācāryya period. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, in his Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism (p. 48) writes that the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (11.5.38-40) says in the usual prophetic style that in the Kali Age there will be found men here and there devoted to Nārāyaṇa, but in large numbers in the Drāviḍa country. The Drāviḍa devotees noticed in the Bhāgavata (who were no doubt the Ālvār saints noted above) must have, therefore, flourished before that work was composed. This is an additional proof of the early origin of this faith.

[1] Of the five kinds of Mādhuryya Rasas adopted by the Bengali Vaiṣṇavas, only three (*i.e.*, Sakhya, Vātsalya and Madhura) are given here.

In Chapter 36 of the Prapañcasāra Tantra (vv. 35-47) the worshipper is directed to a sort of meditation on Viṣṇu in the form of Trailokya-Mohana (Charmer of the whole universe) which is there set forth in terms of sensuous splendour, thus—

"Think of a beautiful garden of Kalpa trees (those granting all desires) fragrant with the scent of flowers and musical with the humming of big bees. Then meditate on Ramāpati (Viṣṇu) seated on Garuḍa (the mythical bird who is the vehicle of Viṣṇu), who is on a red lotus. The husband of Śrī is of the colour of a full blown red *hibiscus* flower, and shines with the radiance of ten million rising suns. He is in the full flush of beauteous youth shedding the nectar of His sweet-scented presence and lovely form. Kind is He to all. He holds a conch-shell, bow, club, noose, discus, sword and mace. His eyes are fixed in gaze upon the face of Śrī, His spouse, who embraces Him in the fullness of her love............... Encircling Viṣṇu and His spouse are their household women with heavy thighs, hips and breasts, sweetly smiling. They look with ardent longing upon Him making obeisance with their soft folding hands. Pierced by the arrows of Anaṅga (Cupid), they move voluptuously. Their lips part but scarcely utter a sound, for they are tremulous with passion. Their hair and clothes are in disorder. They are shameless with passion. ...... Forming lotuses as it were with their hands, they go towards Him and worship His two feet, and with the murmur of hardly uttered words, and with eyes wet with tears of joy, they say to Him—'Supreme Lord, and Husband, be our Refuge.'"[1]

[1] Tāntrik Texts, Vol. III, edited by A. Avalon and Vidyāratna, Introd., pp. 61-63.

Some characteristics of this meditation are of Sahajiyā character. By directing the worshipper to think of the household women worshipping Viṣṇu with passion and calling him husband, the author hits upon a typical Sahajiyā principle of worship in which the devotee adopts the emotion of a woman for her lover, or the sentiment of the Gopīs for Kṛṣṇa. The Prapañcasāra is attributed to Śaṅkarācāryya, and may be placed in the 7th century A. D.

In Prof. Garbe's Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts preserved in the Imperial University Library of Tübingen, a book named Ādhyātmapradīpa has been reviewed under the serial No. 122 on pp. 48-50.[1] It was written by one calling himself Sahaja-Caitanya Purī, who was the disciple of Jñāna-Caitanya Purī. At the end of Chapter IX, in the colophon the author puts himself thus—

Śrī-Jñānacaitanyapurī-parivrāṭ, Śiṣyastadīyaḥ Sahajā-'grya-śabdaḥ । Caitanyapury-uttama-hṛt, tadīye 'dhyātma-pradīpe navamaḥ prakāśaḥ ॥

This means that Jñānacaitanya Purī was a Parivrājaka (homeless mendicant), who had a good disciple called Caitanya Purī, who bore the title of Sahaja before his name. The word Sahaja thus prefixed before the name of the saint may refer to the complexion of the faith he was following when it appears that Caitanya Purī was the common name of the Guru and the disciple.

We may get some idea of the doctrine that was preached by Sahaja-Caitanya Purī from a few quotations from the Ādhyātmapradīpa noted in the catalogue named above.

In the colophon at the end of Chapter VII, we have — Saptama-saṁjñaḥ prakāśaḥ prakāśita-bhakti

[1] I am indebted to Prof. Amulyacharan Vidyābhusan for this information.

-vairāgyaḥ. This shows that the seventh chapter of the book dealt with bhakti-vairāgyaḥ, perhaps on the model of the Niskāma Bhakti-yoga preached in the Gītā, a subject which rises to the highest flight of spirituality. In this chapter we are in possession of the following quotation—"Janmādyāḥ ṣaḍ ime bhāvā dṛṣṭā dehasya nātmanaḥ," about which a commentator says: Nāra-doktaṃ eva *dehātma-viveka*-prakāramāha, etc. The discussion aims at finding out the nature of *deha* (body) and *ātmā* (soul), maintaining that the phenomena of birth, growth, decay, death, etc., are of the body, but not of the soul. In describing the nature of Ātmā, the author has preached the truths of the Vedāntic doctrine maintaining that the Soul is ever pure, and that it is an entity free from decay and change, all-pervading and unqualified in its nature, and that it cannot be known by learned discussions, or austere practices.[1] These are the teachings of a doctrine followed by one who bore the surname of Sahaja, agreeing in main outlines with some of the teachings of the higher aspect of the Jñānī Sahajiyā culture which is still being followed by a thoughtful section of the modern Sahajiyās.

The Brahma-Saṃhitā is a Sanskrit work which is believed to have been brought by Caitanya from the Southern India. In this book there are references to the Sahaja love—

আনন্দচিন্ময়রসাত্মতয়া মনঃস্থ
যঃ প্রাণিনাং প্রতিফলন্ স্মরতামুপেত্য, etc.

Verse 42.

[1] Ātmā nityo'vyayaḥ śuddha ekaḥ kṣetrajña āśrayaḥ।
Avikriyaḥ svadṛg-ghetur vyāpako'saṅgy anāvṛtaḥ ॥

The celebrated Jīva Gosvāmī has commented on this verse as follows—

আনন্দচিন্ময়রস উজ্জ্বলাখ্যঃ প্রেমরসস্তদাত্মতয়া তদালিঙ্গিততয়া প্রাণিনাং মনঃসু প্রতিফলন্, etc.

"I bow to that Lord who is reflected in the minds of all in the form of Divine Love commonly known as the purest conjugal Love (উজ্জ্বল শৃঙ্গার রস)."

In another verse the writer says—

যং ক্রোধ-কাম-সহজপ্রণয়াদি-ভীতি-
বাৎসল্য-মোহ-গুরুগৌরব-সেব্যভাবৈঃ।
সঞ্চিন্ত্য তস্য সদৃশীং তনুমাপুরেতে
গোবিন্দমাদিপুরুষং তমহং ভজামি ॥

Verse 55.

"God can be worshipped by adopting the sentiments of anger, Kāma, *Sahaja love*, fear, affection, Moha, respect and service. The devotee may successfully adopt any of these sentiments."

From this book also we thus find that even in the pre-Caitanya period Sahaja love or one in the form of conjugal love, was recognised as a means of realising God.

In the Assam Plates of Vallabhadeva executed in Śaka Saṃvat 1107 corresponding to 1184 A. D., the term Sahaja occurs as a compound with Dharmma. This king founded an alms-house and endowed it with the revenue of certain villages. In verse 27 of the

And

Na paśyati tvāṃ paramā'-tmano jano
Na budhyate 'dyā' pı samādhi-yuktibhiḥ ı
Kuto'pare tasya manaḥ-śarīra-dhī-
Visarga-sṛṣṭā vayam-aprakāśāḥ ı

fifth plate, we have :—Yadiha Sahajadharmmā dharmma-karmmaikacittāḥ kimapi kimapi karmma kvāpi ye kurvvate te iha dadhatu vibhūtiṃ, etc.

(Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 186.)

This verse has been translated as follows :—" People who, religious by nature and with their minds solely directed to acts of religion, do anything whatever here in regard to this (alms-house), may they with their children.........enjoy prosperity in this world, etc."

(*Ibid*, p. 188).

The term " Sahaja-dharmmā " has been rendered here as 'those who are religious by nature,' by taking the word used in a general sense, but we have here a clear reference to the Sahajiyā doctrine. In fact, the people who follow the natural religion of man, are really those who are designated as the Sahajiyās, and there is nothing here which can stand in the way of accepting this interpretation. The idea of dharmma becoming identified with the nature of men, who are here spoken of as forming a class by themselves, and the manner of referring to it, speak of the superior excellence of the doctrine that was in existence at that time. This refers to the Sahajiyā Cult which was current in Eastern India in the twelfth century A. D.

In the Pithapuraṃ Plates of Vīrachoḍa executed about 1024 Śaka (1102 A. D.), one share of the village granted therein was assigned to " the expounder of Rūpāvatāra" (রূপাবতারং ব্যাচক্ষাণস্থৈকঃ) (Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 94, l. 273). We note this much that the Sahajiyā doctrine is otherwise called Rūpa Dharmma, but cannot go far ahead with the task of identification for want of further particulars.

In the third Pillar Inscription of the Eastern Chālukya Chiefs, divine love has been expressed in

terms of Śṛṅgāra or conjugal union. A person is there spoken of as ভগবৎশ্রিংগ্গারবারিধেঃ (ocean of divine love). (Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 35.) We find here a reference to the idea that spiritual love could assume the complexion of that existing between husband and wife. This inscription is dated 1231 Śaka Saṃvat corresponding to 1309 A. D.

In the Nallur Grant of Harihara II, dated 1321 Śaka (1399 A. D.), we have—

মদ্বংশজাঃ পরমহীপতিবংশজা বা যে বংশজাঃ সততমুজ্জ্বলধর্ম্মচিন্তাঃ।
তদ্ধর্ম্মমেব পরিপালনমুদ্বহন্তি তৎপাদপদ্মযুগলং শিরসা বহামি॥

Verse 40.

Hultzsch has taken উজ্জ্বলধর্ম্মচিন্তাঃ in the sense of ধর্ম্মোজ্জ্বলচিন্তাঃ, and has changed তদ্ধর্ম্মং into মদ্ধর্ম্মং, and given the following rendering :— "I bear on my head the pair of the lotus feet of those kings, either descendants of my race, or of the races of other kings, who, resplendent with charitable thoughts, undertake the protection of my gift."

(Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 126.)

But without admitting the changes noted above, the passage may mean—"The descendants of my race, or those of other kings, who follow উজ্জ্বলধর্ম্ম, and only care for the preservation of that religion, their feet I bear on my head."

By the term তদ্ধর্ম্ম, it seems the author has referred to উজ্জ্বলধর্ম্ম, if the textual evidence is to be relied on, and there is no necessity of changing it into মদ্ধর্ম্ম. Here we have clear reference to a doctrine called Ujjvaladharmma, the term often used by the Sahajiyās to designate their own faith.

In the Plates of Sadāśiva Rāya executed in Śaka Saṁvat 1478 (1556 A. D.), the receiver of the grant is

described as "Dravīḍāgama-vedine." In the footnote Hultzsch writes—"Draviḍa-Veda is in Kittel's Kannaḍa-. English dictionary explained to mean a Vaiṣṇava popular exposition of the Vedas in Tamil verse." (Ep. Ind., IV, p. 5.) It is also identified with the collection of Tamil hymns generally known as Nālāyira-prabandhas, some idea of which we have given above.

This grant was executed not much later than the passing away of Caitanya, the founder of modern Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal. Even in the post-Caitanya period, there were (and still there are) some sects of Sahajiyā complexion outside the province of Bengal, references to which are available from authoritative sources.

H. H. Wilson in his Religious Sects of the Hindus writes about the Sakhī-Bhāvakas, thus—"In order to convey the idea of being as it were her (Rādhā's) followers and friends, a character obviously incompatible with the difference of sex, they assume the female garb, and adopt not only the dress and ornaments, but the manners and occupations of women. They are found at Jaypur, Benares and Bengal." (p. 178.)

The same writer says—"Another Vaiṣṇava sect conforming with the last (Sakhī-Bhāvakas) in the worship of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa was instituted by Charan Dās, who resided at Delhi in the reign of the second Ālemgir (1754-1759 A. D.)." The first disciple of Charan Dās was his own sister, Sahaji Bāi, who wrote the 'Sahaj Prakāśa' (pp. 178-180). These two names are indicative of Sahajiyā connection.

The same author also says that in Bengal the Spaṣṭa-Dāyakas, Kartā-Bhajās, and the Sahajas are of similar nature (p. 170).

Resumé.

We thus find that the Sahajiyā element was present in early Vaiṣṇavism from the 4th century down to the middle of the 18th century A. D., manifesting some of the chief characteristics of the Jñānī Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal. We have also pointed out that the ideal of Parakīya is as old as the Vedas and the Upanīṣads, and that the custom of women's being associated with men for mystic spiritual culture was in vogue even in the pre-Buddhistic period. We have dealt with the subject of ancient sex-worship, and shown that the practice was indigenous with the primitive races, or rather it was the outcome of the general evolution of human mind. Later on, this popular element in religion secured a place for itself in the religious beliefs of almost all the people of the world, and kept its influence felt even in the working of certain religious sects of the most recent time. In India, Tāntrikism had developed itself into a powerful creed, and working on the principle of practical culture in the company of women, had reaped extensive popularity. Holding fast to the ideal of enjoying the pleasure of the senses, it had turned the current of religious thought into a new channel in opposition to the orthodox view of working out spiritual emancipation by means of austere practices of various kinds. Even therein there was a sort of mechanical culture that had developed, for Tāntrikism had never been very keen about the culture of love, which is, however, the basic principle of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal. The Buddhist Sahajiyās have leaned much towards the ideal of spiritual

knowledge, and occupied themselves mainly with the discussions of the dualistic and non-dualistic theories. It is true that certain sects among them ultimately adopted the ideal of mystic culture in the company of women, but that was simply the popular element of Tāntrikism, which, however, could not change the dry philosophical character of the main faith. Many other features of the Buddhist Sahajiyā doctrine noted above are the common characteristics of all the mystic religions, and so they cannot be taken as the essentially distinguishing features of any particular doctrine. In the ancient Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā, however, we have found out a pure faith based on the ideal of love. The Ālvār saints looked upon God as the great lover, who is to be approached with the offerings of love. In the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa we get the idea of what is to be the natural religion of man, and the Ādhyātmapradīpa, while indulging in philosophical discussions about the nature of human body and soul, has ultimately come up to Bhakti-Vairāgya, the highest limit of spiritual devotion to which the Bhāgavata school could aspire to reach. The Plate of Vallabhadeva testifies to the excellence of the Sahajiyā faith that was current at that time, and the Prapañcasāra-Tantra also gives an idea of divine meditation on the standpoint of emotional felicities. But nowhere in all these references is there anything said about practical culture in the company of women, and so we find that the old Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā faith was absolutely free from the grossness of later time that has crept into the fold of the Sahajiyā doctrine. A section of the modern Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyās have maintained this tradition of their predecessors in religion. They not only advocate a pure faith like them, but have gone a step further beyond the limit of Bhakti, by bringing in the conception of Prema in

divine love. This new element in religion was introduced in Bengal, by the Vaiṣṇavas of the Caitanya school and we shall now see how this was effected, and how the modern Sahajiyā doctrine emerged from the fold of the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism with the ideal of love developed into a popular creed.

V. The Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā.

Preliminary.

In modern Vaiṣṇavism prevalent in Bengal, the name of Rādhā is invariably associated with that of Kṛṣṇa, and the formula Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the form of a Dvandva compound is used in the recitation of daily prayer. Here Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Lord, and Rādhā is his eternal consort inseparably united with him in the bond of perpetual love. It is our first concern to see how this Kṛṣṇa-cult came to occupy a position of such exalted prominence in the estimation of the Vaiṣṇavas.[1]

Vaiṣṇavism literally means a kind of religio-philosophical system of worship that has developed round the central figure of Viṣṇu as the Supreme Being. With the development of the conception of Avatāras or Incarnations, one god later on came to be identified with many, and so Vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa, Kṛṣṇa, Gopāla, Rāma, Buddha, and a host of deified personalities came to be regarded as the manifestations of the God Viṣṇu. Among the various names noted above that of Kṛṣṇa is of primary importance to us, and we shall now look back to the past history of Indian religion in order to find out

[1] We are indebted for the following to R. G. Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism and Saivism, and to H. C. Raychaudhuri's Early History of the Vaishṇava Sect. Sometimes there are actual quotations from these works.

how this name came to be associated with Viṣṇu, the Supreme Lord.

The Paurāṇic legends say that Kṛṣṇa is the son of Devakī and Vasudeva, a scion of the Yadu or Vṛṣṇī race settled about Mathurā, and that he had a brother named Baladeva or Saṅkarṣaṇa. Kṛṣṇa as the son of Devakī is mentioned in the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad (III, 17-6). From the testimony of reliable historical records we find that there was a tradition about Kṛṣṇa as a scion of the Yadu race in ancient time. From the Buddhist canonical work called Niddesa, from Patañjali's comment on Pāṇini IV, 3, 98 (*vide* JRAS, 1910, p. 168), and from the inscription found at Ghosuṇḍi in Rajputanā (*vide* Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, No. 6), from the Besnagar inscription of Heliodora (*ibid*, No. 669), as well as from the Nānāghāṭ cave inscription No. 1 (*ibid*, No. 1112), we find that from the time of Pāṇini up to the 1st century B. C., Vāsudeva along with Baladeva or Saṅkarṣaṇa was worshipped as god of gods, and that his worshippers were called Bhāgavatas or Bhaktas. The doctrine advocated by these devotees was at that time called Ekāntika Dharma, and in its background stood the Bhagavadgītā, a discourse professing to be preached by Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa. This faith mingled itself with the existing one in Nārāyaṇa and with that in Viṣṇu, and thus Vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa, Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu became identified (*vide* Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism, pp. 30-35). Then another new element, which is of great importance to us, in the shape of the marvellous deeds of the boy-Kṛṣṇa, and of his amorous dalliances with cowherdesses came to be added to this system of religion. There is no mention of cowherd Kṛṣṇa in the authorities we have hitherto quoted, from which it is clear that the story of Kṛṣṇa's boyhood in

the Gokula was unknown till about the beginning of the Christian era. But we have allusions to the incidents of Kṛṣṇa's boyhood in the Gokula in the Harivaṃśa (vv. 5876-5878) which is the chief authority for it, in the Vāyu-Purāṇa (Chap. 98, vv. 100-102), in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (II, 727-34 etc.), (and in some parts of the Mahābhārata considered interpolated by some scholars, *vide* Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism, p. 36). Sculptures representing some of the events of Kṛṣṇa's boyhood in the Gokula have been discovered at Mandor near Jodhpur (Arch. Survey of India, Annual Report 1905-6, p. 135ff.). The date of the work is considered not earlier than the 4th century A. D This shows that the legend had a currency before that time. The Nāradapañcarātra published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal contains a Saṃhitā called Jñānāmṛtasāra. The glories of the boy Kṛṣṇa are sung in this book, and Rādhā is mentioned as the chief Prakṛti of Kṛṣṇa. It should be noted in this connection that though there are references to Kṛṣṇa's boyhood in the Harivaṃśa, and Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, the name of Rādhā is not found mentioned in these books, as well as in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, which is also an authoritative work of Vaiṣṇavism. The chief Prakṛti of Viṣṇu is usually called Śrī, Lakṣmī or Kamalā in earlier literature. Even Rāmānuja who brought about the revival of Vaiṣṇavism in the South does not mention Rādhā, but names Lakṣmī, Bhū and Līlā as consorts of Nārāyaṇa. The Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa element also seems to be entirely absent from the system of Madhva, and Rādhā is not mentioned by him. Then came Nimbārka in the 12th century A. D., who gave exclusive prominence to Kṛṣṇa and his mistress Rādhā. He was followed by Vallabha in the South, and by Caitanya in Bengal in the 16th century A. D. both of whom

preached the worship of boy-Kṛṣṇa and his Parakīyā consort Rādhā. Thus Rādhā cult became a prominent feature of later Vaiṣṇavism.

In Bengal we are in possession of some Bengali Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa songs attributed to Umāpati Dhara, and later on Jayadeva in the later part of the 12th century composed his celebrated lyrical poem, the Gīta-Govinda, in Sanskrit. But these are poetical compositions which do not give us a comprehensive view of the faith, as there is nothing said about the doctrinal and ceremonial features meant for the guidance of the people at large. The Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana and the lyrical songs of Caṇḍīdāsa and Vidyāpati are also of this nature. They simply paved the way for the coming in of a great prophet who in the person of Caitanya in the 16th century promulgated the worship of Kṛṣṇa for ever associated with Rādhā, and idealised into an image of pure love. Vallabha and his followers developed the ceremonial side of the religion, while Caitanya and his disciples devoted themselves to the cultivation of the emotional side. This is one of the originalities which gave the Caitanya cult of Bengal the characteristic appellation of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism. Let us now see what record we have of such novelties in the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava literature of Bengal.

The Caitanya cult.

We begin by singing panegyrics on Love. "Love is so great a master that he is able to make any one a poet. For though a man be ever so much a stranger to the Muses, yet as soon as his soul is touched by love, he becomes a poet in all that kind of creative power which is the proper province of the Muses." It is for this reason that Love can inspire the fancy of the lover to impart to his beloved that which he does not possess. In the modern Vaiṣṇavism of Bengal Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are the idols

of love, and the Vaiṣṇavas seek to approach them with the offerings of love only. It is no wonder, therefore, that they should try to improve upon the prevalent conception of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, and to heighten the importance of love in the scale of devotion in order to put it at the base of a new theological system of their own making. That something of this nature was actually done by the Vaiṣṇavas of the Caitanya school is evident from the testimony of the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava (including the Sahajiyā) literature. In the first place, the Sahajiyās trace the origin of this new emotional faith to Caitanya, whose teachings, they say, have come down to them filtered through the writings of Svarupa, Rūpa, Raghunāth, Rāmānanda, and other Vaiṣṇava worthies. We quote below from some of the current Sahajiyā works :—

বিবর্ত্তয়ে ধর্ম্ম গোসাঞি স্বরূপ হইতে।
আসিয়া প্রকাশ হইল রসিক ভকতে॥
অষ্ট শক্তি মহাপ্রভু রূপে সমর্পিয়া।
যে প্রকারে দিল আগে দ্রব্য উঘারিয়া॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 2.

বিস্তার করিলা প্রভু প্রেমের পসার।
স্বরূপ রামানন্দ সনে রসের বিচার॥
* * * *
নিজতত্ত্ব জানাইলা গোসাঞি শ্রীরূপে॥
শ্রীরূপে করুণা করি সব তত্ত্ব দিলা।
ব্রজরস নিগূঢ় মর্ম্ম সব জানাইলা॥
* * * *
ব্রজে সার শ্রীরূপ গোসাঞি রাগ ধর্ম্ম।
শ্রীরূপ জানিতে পারে চৈতন্যের মর্ম্ম॥

চৈতন্য তত্ত্বের রূপ সীমা রতিশূর।
রাগ মতে প্রকাশিলা প্রেমতত্ত্বপুর॥

Rasakadambakalikā, pp. 20-21.

এত চিন্তি নবদ্বীপে কৈল অবতার।
অশেষ বিশেষে রস কৈল পরচার॥

*   *   *   *

নিগূঢ় ভাবামৃত মনসি আস্বাদন।
স্বরূপ, রূপ, রঘুনাথ জানেন তিন জন॥

*   *   *   *

স্বরূপ, রূপ, আর রঘুনাথ দাস।
এ তিন প্রসাদে মাধুর্য্য জগতে প্রকাশ॥

Ratvilāsa-Paddhati, pp. 31-33.

যুগল মধুর প্রেম   লক্ষবান যেন হেম
হেন ধন প্রকাশিল যাঁরা।
জয় রূপ সনাতন   দেহ মোরে এই ধন
সেই রত্নময় গলে হারা॥

Vṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā, p. 7.

সবে মাত্র রামানন্দ জানয়ে অন্তরে।
আর জানে এক মাত্র স্বরূপ দামোদরে॥
অন্য যদি কেহ জানে সেই কৃপালেশে।
শ্রীরূপেরে কৈলা কৃপা জানি পূর্ব্বদাসে॥

Ratnasāra, p. 42.

চৈতন্যের গূঢ়তত্ত্ব স্বরূপ গোসাঞি জানে।
রঘুনাথে শিখাইলা করিয়া যতনে॥

Amṛtarasāvalī, pp. 3-4.

রামানন্দ রায় মুখে যাহার প্রচার ॥
শ্রীস্বরূপ শ্রীরূপ শ্রীসনাতন।
এই সব বিনা আর না জানে অন্যজন ॥

U. M. No. 615, p. 4.

শ্রীরূপ ব্রজ লীলা করিল বিস্তার।
পরকীয়া মত তাহা করিল প্রচার ॥

U. M. No. 559, p. 7.

Quotations similar to these can be multiplied at ease. Almost every Sahajiyā book makes assertions of this nature. Some critics may say that these are groundless allegations of the Sahajiyās made for the purpose of establishing their doctrine on the authority of these learned saints. But that does not affect the issue in the least, for our object is to see what the Sahajiyās themselves say about the origin of their doctrine. If they say that their religion came from Caitanya through Rūpa, Svarūpa and others, we are to conclude that they culled a doctrine from the teachings and writings of these persons. Even their allegations do not seem to be arbitrary, for we have the same idea expressed in the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta--

অতি গূঢ় হেতু এই ত্রিবিধ প্রকার।
দামোদর স্বরূপ হৈতে যাহার প্রচার ॥
স্বরূপ গোসাঞি প্রভুর অতি অন্তরঙ্গ।
তাহাতে জানেন প্রভুর এ সব প্রসঙ্গ ॥

Canto I, Chap. 4.

তবে প্রভু ব্রজে পাঠাইলা রূপ সনাতন।
প্রভু আজ্ঞায় দুই ভাই আইলা বৃন্দাবন ॥

*   *   *   *

প্রভু আজ্ঞায় কৈল সর্ব্বশাস্ত্রের বিচার।
ব্রজের নিগূঢ় ভক্তি করিলা প্রচার॥

Canto II, Chap. I.

Also চৈতন্যলীলা রত্নসার স্বরূপের ভাণ্ডার
তেঁহো থুইলা রঘুনাথের কণ্ঠে।
তাহা কিছু যে শুনিল তাহা ইহ বিবরিল
ভক্তগণে দিল এই ভেটে॥

Ibid, Chap. 2.

স্বরূপ গোসাঞির মত রূপ রঘুনাথ জানে যত
তাহা লিখি, নাহি মোর দোষ।

Ibid.

Its originalities.

We thus find that there is agreement in the Vaiṣṇava and Sahajiyā works in this respect. An enquiry into the cause of such allegations will, therefore, not be unprofitable. We have seen from a quotation noted above that Rūpa and Sanātana were sent to Vṛndāvana by Caitanya with instructions to write religious books dealing with what is there called mystic cult peculiar to Vraja.[1] Now, what are the characteristics of this new faith on which so much stress is laid? It is quite evident that something must have been done by these learned saints in order to earn for themselves the reputation of doing something original in their own way. As Vaiṣṇavism, we know, is of a very great antiquity, so they cannot be regarded as the promulgators of this religion. What they actually did was

[1] তবে প্রভু ব্রজে পাঠাইলা রূপ সনাতন।
প্রভুর আজ্ঞায় দুই ভাই আইলা বৃন্দাবন॥
প্রভু আজ্ঞায় কৈল সর্ব্ব শাস্ত্রের বিচার।
ব্রজের নিগূঢ় ভক্তি করিলা প্রচার॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto II, Chap. 1.

to give a new turn to the current of Vaiṣṇavism, and hence their originality was acknowledged for preaching an old faith under a new garb. We shall now try to understand the nature of this innovation.

Kṛṣṇa is an Avatārī.

I. From the Paurāṇika literature we know that Kṛṣṇa is an Avatāra or Incarnation of Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa.[1] The followers of Caitanya could not be satisfied with the idea that Kṛṣṇa, who, they say, was reborn as Caitanya should be regarded as a manifestation of another God. As Avatāra means part manifestation,[2] the acceptance of this idea leads to the acknowledgment of a Supreme Being who is superior to Kṛṣṇa. It is, therefore, maintained by them that Kṛṣṇa is not an Avatāra, but he himself is an Avatārī, meaning thereby that he is the highest Supreme Being from whom emanated all other Avatāras, and that he is the First Cause there being none higher than him.[3] In this conception of Kṛṣṇa, we mark the desire of the Vaiṣṇavas to make him the greatest of the great,[4] for even

[1] As noted in the Mahābhārata, Vāyu-Purāṇa, Varāha-Purāṇa, Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, etc., *vide* Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism, by R. G. Bhandarkar, pp. 41-42.

[2] অবতার সব—পুরুষের কলা অংশ।

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 2.

[3] সেই কৃষ্ণ অবতারী ব্রজেন্দ্র কুমার।

And অবতারীর দেহে সব অবতারের স্থিতি। *Ibid.*

Also দীপ হৈতে যৈছে বহুদীপের জ্বলন।
মূল এক দীপ তাহা করিয়ে গণন॥
তৈছে সব অবতারের কৃষ্ণ সে কারণ। *Ibid.*

[4] প্রাকৃতাপ্রাকৃত সৃষ্ট্যে যত জীব রূপ।
তাহার যে আত্মা তুমি মূল স্বরূপ॥
পৃথ্বী যৈছে ঘটকুলের কারণ আশ্রয়।
জীবের নিদান তুমি, তুমি সর্ব্বাশ্রয়॥ *Ibid.*

Nārāyaṇa is said to be a manifestation of Kṛṣṇa,[1] thus reversing the order of mutual relationship as taught by the Purāṇas.

A new theory about Kṛṣṇa's birth.

II. From the Purāṇas we know that the Avatāra of Kṛṣṇa was assumed for the destruction of Kaṃsa, and of many other demons residing in the cow-settlement of Gokula and elsewhere.[2] But in the doctrine of love advocated by the Vaiṣṇavas, this sort of killing and destroying is uncongenial to the spirit of the faith, and so they do not attach much importance to this idea. They, however, maintain that the real cause of the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa was— (*i*) to taste the exhilarating pleasure of love, and (*ii*) to offer an illustration of the Rāgānugā mode of divine love,[3] so that the people could learn the emotional doctrine by imitating his own example.[4] The followers of a faith based on

1 সেই তিনের অংশী পরব্যোম-নারায়ণ।
তেঁহ তোমার বিলাস, তুমি মূল নারায়ণ॥ *Ibid.*

2 *Vide* Mahābhārata, Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śāntiparva, Harivaṃśa (vv. 5876-5878), Vāyu-Purāṇa (98/100-102), Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (II, 7.27-34) etc.

3 প্রেমরস-নির্য্যাস করিতে আস্বাদন।
রাগমার্গ-ভক্তি লোকে করিতে প্রচারণ॥
রসিকশেখর কৃষ্ণ পরম করুণ।
এই দুই হেতু হৈতে ইচ্ছার উদ্গম॥
Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

4 এই সব রস নির্য্যাস করিব আস্বাদ।
এই দ্বারে করিব সর্ব্ব ভক্তের প্রসাদ॥
ব্রজের নির্ম্মল রাগ শুনি ভক্তগণ।
রাগ মার্গে ভজে যেন ছাড়ি ধর্ম্মকর্ম্ম॥
Ibid.

the ideal of love must have the necessity of taking a view like this in justification of their own creed.

The philosophy of Kaiśora love.

III. "Love is the youngest of the gods. Of this he himself gives us a convincing proof by his running away from Old Age, and outrunning him who is evidently so swift-footed, for Old Age, you know, arrives and is with us sooner that we desire. Between Love and him there is a natural antipathy, so that Love comes not within a wide distance of him, but makes his abode with youth, and is always found in company with the young."[1] The Vaiṣṇavas are also of this opinion. They maintain that Kaiśora is the best time when pure love grows in the mind, and declare that love always resides in the Kaiśora.[2] It is for this reason that they always sing of the Kaiśora love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. The idea that Kṛṣṇa had childhood and old age, or that he had to attend to multifarious works of life, is not so very important for their purpose, and so the Vaiṣṇavas of the Caitanya school have sparingly dealt with these matters, singing mainly of the various aspects of the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa under the headings of Purva-Rāga (First dawn of love), Abhisāra (Secret union), Ākṣepānurāga (Wailings prompted by love),

[1] Plato's Banquet, p. 64.

[2] শ্রেষ্ঠমুজ্জ্বলমেবাস্ত কৈশোরস্য তথাপ্যদঃ, etc.

Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, Dakṣiṇa, 1-159.

কিশোর বয়স নিত্য প্রেমের স্বরূপ।

Ādya-Sārasvata-Kārikā, p. 4.

কিশোর কিশোরী দুইটী জন।
শৃঙ্গার রসের মূরতি হন ॥

Caṇḍīdāsa's Song No. 776 (P. E.).

Milana (Union), Viraha (Separation), etc. They know only of youthful Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa [1] enamoured of each other, and this is the main topic of the vast Padāvalī literature that has grown up in Bengal.

Incarnation of Caitanya.

IV. Caitanya is regarded by his followers as Kṛṣṇa reborn in Nadīyā on a new errand harmless in its nature and interesting in its scope and purpose. In the first place they say that Kṛṣṇa had the necessity of maintaining a military organisation for fulfilling his mission of destroying the demons, but in his Avatāra as Caitanya he simply relied on the support of his companions for preaching the doctrine of love.[2] They further maintain that in the Dvāpara Age, Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa had separate bodies, though they had the same soul between them, but in the Kali Age both of them were united in the person of Caitanya.[3] The main teaching is that Kṛṣṇa incarnated himself as Caitanya both with the soul and body of Rādhā in order to have a practical realisation of the feeling of joy and love that was experienced by

[1] কিশোর স্বরূপ কৃষ্ণ স্বয়ং অবতারী।

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 2.

কিশোর বয়সে সদা বিহরে ব্রজপুরে।

Āgama, p. 2.

[2] অন্য অবতারে সব সৈন্য-শস্ত্র সঙ্গে।
চৈতন্য কৃষ্ণের সৈন্য অঙ্গ-উপাঙ্গে॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 3.

[3] রাধা কৃষ্ণ এক আত্মা, দুই দেহ ধরি।
অন্যোন্যে বিলসে রস আস্বাদন করি॥
সেই দুই এক এবে—চৈতন্য গোসাঞি।
রস আস্বাদিতে দোঁহে হৈলা এক ঠাঁই॥

Ibid, Chap. 4.

Rādhā, his mistress of Vṛndāvana.[1] This was a new turn which Vaiṣṇavism took in Bengal when it merged itself into the cult of Caitanya.

V. The Vaiṣṇavas have also created a new Heaven for Kṛṣṇa. Gokula, Mathurā, Dvārakā and Vṛndāvana are places of this earth associated with the legends of Kṛṣṇa. Vaikuṇṭha, we know, is the highest Heaven where resides Nārāyaṇa, the God of the gods. But as the Vaiṣṇavas have raised Kṛṣṇa to the status of the Supreme God from whom emanated Nārāyaṇa, the heaven of Kṛṣṇa has also been placed over Vaikuṇṭha. The place is called Kṛṣṇa-Loka subdivided into various strata called Dvārakā, Mathurā, Vṛndāvana, Goloka and Vrajadhāma, etc.[2] This was quite necessary for the Vaiṣṇavas in justification of the new interpretation that they were going to put on the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa.

1 রাধাভাবদ্যুতিসুবলিতং নৌমি কৃষ্ণস্বরূপম্।

Kaḍacā by Svarūpa.

রাধা ভাব কান্তি দুই অঙ্গীকার করি ॥
শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য রূপে কৈল অবতার।

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

শ্রীরাধায়াঃ প্রণয়মহিমা কীদৃশো বানয়ৈবা— etc.

Of the Kaḍacā of Svarūpa, quoted before.

2 প্রকৃতির পর পরব্যোম নামে ধাম।
কৃষ্ণ বিগ্রহ যৈছে প্রভুত্বাদি গুণবান ॥
সর্ব্বগ অনন্ত বিভু বৈকুণ্ঠাদি ধাম।
কৃষ্ণ কৃষ্ণ অবতারের তাঁহাই বিশ্রাম ॥
তাহার উপরিভাগে কৃষ্ণলোক খ্যাতি।
দ্বারকা মথুরা গোকুল ত্রিবিধত্বে স্থিতি ॥
সর্ব্বোপরি শ্রীগোকুল ব্রজলোক ধাম।
শ্রীগোলক শ্বেতদ্বীপ বৃন্দাবন নাম ॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 5.

VI. Rādhā, we have pointed out (see p. 158), is not mentioned in earlier Vaiṣṇava literature, but the later Vaiṣṇavas having developed the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa cult, have raised her to the dignity of the chief Prakṛti of Kṛṣṇa, maintaining that his other Prakṛtis are simply part manifestations of Rādhā.[1]

The conception of Aiśvaryya and Mādhuryya.

VII. It is now quite clear why Caitanya and his companions were regarded as the promulgators of a new doctrine. But their originality does not end here. They had adopted the ideal of perfect love, and in doing so, they were dissatisfied with the idea that Kṛṣṇa, their idol of love, should be placed in an inaccessible position by being invested with all sorts of divine glory. It is the nature of love that it constantly tends to lessen the difference between the lover and his object of love. But if God be considered immensely superior to us in every respect, there is a limit beyond which divine love cannot go. In its highest perfection it can take the complexion of Bhakti (reverence mixed with awe), but when it steps into the domain of Prema, God comes down from his citadel of grandeur, and presents himself before us in a homely way. It is for this reason that all true lovers of God call him father, mother, or a friend. We shall now see how the Vaiṣṇavas have utilised this principle to lay the foundation of a new devotional faith.

---

[1] মহাভাব স্বরূপা শ্রীরাধাঠাকুরাণী ।
সর্ব্বগুণ-খনি কৃষ্ণ-কান্তা-শিরোমণি ॥

And শ্রীরাধিকা হৈতে কান্তাগণের বিস্তার ।

Also লক্ষ্মীগণ হয় তাঁর অংশ বিভূতি ॥

Ibid, Canto I, Chap. 4.

Aiśvaryya explained.

In the first place, we must have a clear idea about the significance of the terms Aiśvaryya and Mādhuryya technically used with reference to the manifestation of God, according to which the devotees are classified into two main divisions.[1] In explaining these terms, the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta says—"The whole world is following the Aiśvaryya manifestation of God, but I (Kṛṣṇa is represented to have said) have no pleasure in the love based on a conception like this. I do not bind myself in the love of the devotee who, while thinking of me as God, considers himself far inferior to me." [2]

Here we find that the main characteristic of the conception based on Aiśvaryya is the idea that Kṛṣṇa is God, who is immensely superior to us. This brings in its train a conception about the grandeur of Kṛṣṇa, of his possessing supernatural potentialities and mysterious divine power creating or destroying at will, and the like. Indeed, all our mythological works teach us the legends of Kṛṇṣa (like the works of other religions speaking about their Prophets or Saints) mainly moulded on this principle. At his birth, we are told, the guards were lulled to sleep, when he was taken to Vṛndāvana a snake protected him from rain and thunder, a jackal showed the way, and the

[1] ঐশ্বর্য্য মাধুর্য্য রসে ভক্তমাত্র দ্বয়।

Rasasāra, p. 12.

[2] ঐশ্বর্য্য জ্ঞানেতে সব জগত মিশ্রিত।
ঐশ্বর্য্য শিথিল প্রেমে নাহি মোর প্রীত॥
আমারে ঈশ্বর মানে—আপনাকে হীন।
তার প্রেমে বশ আমি না হই অধীন॥

Canto I, Chap. 4.

river Yamunā lifted him up when he was dropped into the water. The holding of the hill Govardhana, the destruction of Kaṁsa and the other demons, indeed every act of his life is said to have been accomplished with his divine power. When a man thinks of Kṛṣṇa in this light, his mind becomes filled with awe, and however bold he may be, he must hesitate a thousand times to put a step forward in his attempt to embrace God. So, in the quotation noted above, Kṛṣṇa is represented to have said that he feels no charm in the devotion of a man who holds this view.

Mādhuryya explained.

Let us now turn to see what is meant by the Mādhuryya Bhāva Here we have nothing superhuman or extraordinary in our conception about the power of Kṛṣṇa, he being thought of and loved as a man born among us, holding positions in relation to us either of a son (as, in fact, he was to Yaśodā), or of a friend (as he was to his companions), or of a husband (as he was to Rādhā and the Gopīs). It is, therefore, put in the mouth of Kṛṣṇa that the love of this kind is pleasing to him.[1]

[1] মোর পুত্র মোর সখা মোর প্রাণপতি।
এই ভাবে করে যেই মোরে শুদ্ধ ভক্তি ॥
আপনাকে বড় মানে,—আমারে সম হীন।
সেই ভাবে আমি হই তাহার অধীন ॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

মাতা মোরে পুত্রভাবে করেন বন্ধন।
অতি হীন জ্ঞানে করে লালন পালন ॥
সখা শুদ্ধ সখ্যে করে স্কন্ধে আরোহণ।
তুমি কোন বড় লোক ?—তুমি আমি সম ॥
*　　*　　*　　*
এই শুদ্ধ ভক্তি লঞা করিমু অবতার। *Ibid.*

This is the basis of the true Mādhuryya conception of God, the illustration of which was, as it is said, one of the objects of God's incarnating himself as Kṛṣṇa.[1] This is undoubtedly an innovation introduced by the followers of Caitanya, and herein the Caitanya school differs mainly from the previous Kṛṣṇa cult and the Bhāgavata school. Rūpa, in his Vidagdha-Mādhava (1-1-2), says—

অনর্পিতচরীং চিরাৎ করুণয়াবতীর্ণঃ কলৌ
সমর্পয়িতুমুন্নতোজ্জ্বলরসাং স্বভক্তিশ্রিয়ং।
হরিঃ পুরটসুন্দরদ্যুতিকদম্বসন্দীপিতঃ
সদা হৃদয়কন্দরে স্ফুরতু বঃ শচীনন্দনঃ॥

This means that Divine love practically illustrated by Caitanya in the form of superior conjugal love, was not manifested by any incarnation before. Echoing this sentiment, the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta puts forth in the mouth of Kṛṣṇa that he should, in his incarnation as Caitanya, practically demonstrate this sort of Divine love, the like of which was not even found in the Vaikuṇṭha, the heaven of Nārāyaṇa.[2] This shows that these Vaiṣṇavas of that time were of the opinion that they were going to put a new interpretation to the doctrine of divine love. At any rate, the writings of Rūpa and his colleagues and followers are responsible for the popularity of this new current of thought.

It is a Sahajiyā ideal.

But what connection has this sort of love with the Sahajiyā doctrine is our point of enquiry now. To a man with his limited power this love becomes at once most natural, and hence easy

[1] এই শুদ্ধ ভক্তি লঞা করিমু অবতার।
Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

[2] বৈকুণ্ঠাদ্যে নাহি যে যে লীলার প্রচার।
সে সে লীলা করিব, যাতে মোর চমৎকার॥ *Ibid.*

for adoption. To bear the sight of God in all his glory requires a capacity which has unfortunately not been given to many of us. When Kṛṣṇa revealed his Grand Form to Arjjuna on the eve of the battle of Kurukṣetra, the latter, his most intimate friend, could hardly look at it, though he was endowed with divine vision, and had to cry for the concealment of that awful spectacle. It is for this reason that the superb vastness of God is moulded into more conceivable form of worship in human society. Inspite of such modifications, there is always something supernatural surrounding the conception of those who receive the homage of men, which it is impossible to be given up. Every current religion bow to the authority of some one who was born as a man, and lived and died like other human beings, yet he is always invested with extraordinary powers for proving his divine heritage. Our feelings find a check when we go to claim him wholly as our own, and this obstacle the followers of Caitanya tried to remove in their new interpretation of the doctrine of Caitanya. Love God as you love your own child, friend or husband, and then only you can attain to the nearness of God under the influence of real love which subsists among persons of equal status only. On this point Caṇḍīdāsa says that the love of the moon and *cakora* (the bird poetically represented as living by drinking the nectar of the moon) is not of this nature, for both of them are not of equal status.[1] In the sphere of love, in fact, equality is the most important factor. This is the simplification

[1] কি ছার চকোর চাঁদ দুঁহু সম নহে।
ত্রিভুবনে হেন নাই, চণ্ডীদাস কহে॥

Song No. 193.

of a most complex problem, and this is the basis of the conception of Sahaja or natural love. Of this love, the followers of Caitanya sang, and in a new tune. Kṛṣṇa Dās Kavirāj, who in his Caitanya-Caritāmṛta has embodied the teachings of the Gosvāmis, has clearly stated that he was writing there about this Sahaja love—

নাহি কাঁহা স্ববিরোধ নাহি কাঁহা অনুরোধ
সহজ বস্তু করি বিবরণ ।

Canto II, Chap. 2.

Commentators have twisted the meaning of this passage without admitting that there is a reference here to Sahaja in a technical sense. But there is nothing to be frightened at in this manner. Here Sahaja love means the natural affection of man used in the worship of God. The philosophy of this love had been preached by the companions of Caitanya, and the author of the Caritāmṛta has simply copied from the writings of those worthies. So, there is nothing arbitrary in this statement, and there is also no reference to the Sahajiyā doctrine as it is practised now. We think we are not committing an offence of immense magnitude by writing this.

Origin of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine.

This Mādhuryya love, as we have noted before, is of four kinds:—(1) Dāsya (that of a servant), (2) Sakhya (that of a friend), (3) Vātsalya (that of parents) and (4) Sṛṅgāra or Madhura (that of a husband and wife). Of these four kinds of emotions, Sṛṅgāra or Madhura is said to be the best of all. Madhura is again subdivided into Svakīyā and Parakīyā, of which the latter is the better of the two.[1] Up to this limit the Vaiṣṇavas and

[1] This has been elaborately dealt with in Chapter II.

the Sahajiyās are in perfect agreement, but beyond this the Sahajiyā branch has separated from the main current, and hence this is the turning point of the Sahajiyā doctrine. The Vaiṣṇavas have not discarded the other three emotions, though they lay special stress on Madhura, for it is maintained by them that a devotee may adopt any of the four in his attempt to realise God.[1] Even the followers of Caitanya are classified on the basis of the nature of their love falling into these four classes, maintaining that they were all equally dear to Caitanya inspite of their adopting different emotions.[2] But the Sahajiyās have adopted the Madhura Rasa only, asserting that the mystic doctrine of love rests on the foundation of this emotion.[3] With this

[1] দাস্ত সখ্য বাৎসল্য আর যে শৃঙ্গার।
চারিভাবের চতুর্ব্বিধ ভক্তই আধার॥
নিজ নিজ ভাব সভে শ্রেষ্ঠ করি মানে।
নিজ ভাবে করে কৃষ্ণ সুখ আস্বাদনে॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

[2] পুরীর বাৎসল্য মুখ্য রামানন্দের শুদ্ধ সখ্য
গোবিন্দাদ্যের শুদ্ধ দাস্যরস।
গদাধর জগদানন্দ স্বরূপের মুখ্য রসানন্দ
এই চারি ভাবে প্রভু বশ॥

Ibid, Canto II, Chap. 2.

[3] শ্রীরূপের অনুগত ভজনে যে হয় রত
স্থিতি তার কেবল মধুরে॥
মধুর উজ্জল রস সদা শৃঙ্গারের বশ
ব্রজ-রাজ-নন্দন-বিষয়।
ঐশ্বর্য্য সুগুপ্ত তাতে মাধুর্য্য প্রভাবে যাতে
তাহার আশ্রয় ভক্তচয়॥

Rāgānugābhajana-Darpaṇa, pp. 12-13.

conception they have separated from the parent stock, and working on this principle, they have turned their thoughts to a new channel. Though in their theological works they have dealt with all the four Rasas just as they have been treated in the works of the earlier Vaiṣṇava writers, yet they have practically ignored the other three, holding fast to Madhura alone. Henceforth their activities are marked by characteristic independence of thought. We have already stated that Parakīyā was treated as an adoptable Rasa like the Svakīyā by the Vaiṣṇavas of the Caitanya school. Though they have given preference to Parakīyā, yet Svakīyā has not been discarded by them. On the other hand, they advanced various arguments to ascribe Svakīyā character to Rādhā who was a Parakīyā consort of Kṛṣṇa. But the Sahajiyās by following a different course have gone so far as to declare that Svakīyā is merely a semblance of love, and that Parakīyā stands supreme.[1] It is thus quite evident that the current of the Sahajiyā doctrine could no longer flow with that of Vaiṣṇavism. A separation was therefore, effected at this junction, and a new branch was formed with teachings characteristic of this ideal. This is the first beginning of the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal.

We thus find that in the sphere of Mādhuryya culture, the Sahajiyās could not think of any other

নিরন্তর তারতম্য ঐশ্বর্য্য মাধুর্য্যেতে।
প্রেমরসের সাগর নায়িকা ভাবেতে॥

Rāgamayikaṇā, p. 10.

1 পরকীয়া রাগ অতি রসের উল্লাস।
স্বকীয়াতে রাগ নাই, কহিল আভাস॥

Ratnasāra, p. 65 (*vide* also Chapter II, above).

emotion except that of Madhura, the ideal of conjugal love being the only ideal that was adopted by them in mystic culture, and this was also of the Parakīyā complexion. They were so much enamoured of this new ideal that they could not rest satisfied with the teachings of the older school, and so they have gone a step ahead while dealing with this ideal of Mādhuryya. It is well-known that the Rāsa of Kṛṣṇa in the Vṛndāvana was a typical display of the Madhura Rasa, but the Sahajiyās maintain that this was, in fact, the play of God with the human beings under the influence of divine power. The Bhāgavata says that Kṛṣṇa so multiplied himself during the Rāsa festival that each Gopī found a Kṛṣṇa sporting with her. This is nothing but the manifestation of divine power,[1] and so it is maintained by the Sahajiyās that the Mādhuryya of the Rāsa is not pure Mādhuryya, but Mādhuryya mixed up with Aiśvaryya.[2] Even

Ardent advocacy of this ideal.

1 ঈশ্বর সিদ্ধান্ত দেখ শ্রীভাগবতে।
কংস বধ কালে, আর রাসের বেলাতে ॥

* * * *

বৃন্দাবন হইতে যবে মথুরাতে গেলা।
কংস বধে সভাতলে ঐশ্বর্য্য প্রকাশিলা ॥

* * * *

তবে দেখ বৃন্দাবনে যবে কৈলা রাস।
শত কোটী গোপী সঙ্গে রসের বিলাস ॥
যোগমায়াশ্রিত হ'য়া পূর্ণ ঐশ্বর্য্যময়।
একেক গোপী একেক কৃষ্ণ বিহার করয় ॥

Rasasāra, p. 3

অনীশ্বরে ঈশ্বরে যোগমায়ায় ঘটিত।
অতএব ব্রজলীলা ঐশ্বর্য্য মাধুর্য্য ॥

Rasakadambakalikā, p. 4.

such a union is not considered by them free from blame. The Bhāgavata (10-33-37) says—"Though the Gopīs went to Kṛṣṇa, yet their husbands bore no spite against him, for they would always feel the presence of their wives near them—so overwhelmed they were by the miraculous power of Kṛṣṇa." [1]

It is not a happy idea that Kṛṣṇa beguiled the Gopālas with his Divine Power, as if by magic, in order to sport with their wives in the forest. Such an act cannot go unchallenged in human society, so it is said that God committed an impious act in the Vṛndāvana.[2] Of course, the situation changes, if it is maintained that Kṛṣṇa was the incarnation of God, but with the idea of God, pure love cannot be brought into play,[3] for it subsists only between man and man, but not between man and God.[4] The mystic Mādhuryya is purely based on earthly sentiment, and it has nothing to do with the conception of God.[5] Even the author of

[1] And hence it is said—

মায়াশ্রিত পরকীয়া লিখে ভাগবতে।

Ratívilāsa-Paddhati, p. 7.

[2] জ্ঞান মার্গে পরক্রীয়া ভগবান কৈল।
ধর্ম্ম ছাড়ি ব্রজেতে অধর্ম্ম আচরিল॥

Vṛhat-Prema-bhakti-Candrikā, pp. 8-9.

[3] ঈশ্বর স্বভাব যদি মাধুর্য্য আস্বাদয়।
ভাবসিদ্ধ প্রেম তার কভু নাহি হয়॥

Ratnasāra, p. 3.

[4] জীবে ঈশ্বরে ইহার নাহি উপাদান।

Rativilāsapaddhati, p. 2.

[5] অনীশ্বর লীলা হয় রহস্য-মাধুর্য্য।

Ratnasāra, p. 7.

the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta has criticised that statement of the Bhāgavata which says that the Gopīs met with Kṛṣṇa under the influence, as it were, of Divine magic. Putting forth in the mouth of Kṛṣṇa, he says that this idea was unknown either to the Gopīs or to Kṛṣṇa. They were, in fact, enamoured of one another, and met under the influence of strong love, disregarding all social conventions. It was the love between man and woman, so sometimes they could meet together, while at times no meeting would take place, as it usually happens in the affairs of common love. The idea of Divine magic had no place in this love. Then it is said that this sort of love should lend colour to Divine love that is to be adopted by the devotees, and this is the lesson that is to be learnt from the legend of Vraja.[1]

This was a new philosophy of the spirit of Divine love, which was first preached by the followers of

And ——

প্রাকৃত নর লীলাতে মাধুর্য্যের সার।
অপ্রাকৃত দেবলীলা ঐশ্বর্য্য অপার॥

U. M. No. 572, p. 3

যো বিষয়ে গোপীগণের উপপতি ভাবে।
যোগমায়া করিবেক আপন প্রভাবে॥
আমিহ না জানি তাহা, না জানে গোপীগণ।
দুঁহার রূপে গুণে দুঁহার নিত্য হরে মন॥
ধর্ম্ম ছাড়ি রাগে দুঁহে করয়ে মিলন।
কভু মিলে কভু না মিলে দৈবের ঘটন॥
এই সব রস নির্য্যাস করিব আস্বাদ।
এই দ্বারে করিব সর্ব্ব ভক্তের প্রসাদ॥
ব্রজের নির্ম্মল রাগ শুনি ভক্তগণ।
রাগ মার্গে ভজে যেন ছাড়ি ধর্ম্ম কর্ম্ম॥

Canto I, Chap. 4.

Caitanya in Bengal as the basis of a new faith, and they were fully convinced of their own originality. As this is purely Post-Caitanya in origin, we cannot reasonably expect to find any other doctrine interpreted in this light in the Pre-Caitanya period. We have, indeed, a Sahajiyā element in Tāntrikism, in the Buddhist and the earlier Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā doctrines, but each of them had, as we have pointed out, a distinctive feature of its own, and was not imbued with the spirit of the Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā Cult which holds out the natural love of man as the best means of supreme spiritual realisation. In the first few Sahajiyā books that were written on the philosophy of this cult, this idea has been elaborated with the help of instructive allegories. In order to have a clear idea about the nature of the Sahajiyā doctrine it is necessary that we must review its earliest compositions, to which, therefore, we turn our attention at this stage.

The First Four Sahajiyā Works.

The Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī has given us the names of the first four Sahajiyā books, thus—

আগমসার আগে হয়, আনন্দভৈরব তারপর।
ইহার পর অমৃতরত্নাবলী জানিবে নির্দ্ধার ॥
ইহার পর অমৃতরসাবলী রসের সমুদ্র।
এ রসতরঙ্গে মগ্ন প্রজাপতি রুদ্র ॥

P. 30.

According to this statement Āgamasāra is the first Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā work, then comes Ānandabhairava to be followed by Amṛtaratnāvalī and Amṛtarasāvalī. From the internal evidences of the last three books we are led to believe that the account of the Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī is correct.

Āgama Grantha.

We have not been able to find out a book of the name of Āgamasāra, but there is a work named Āgama Grantha written by one who calls himself Yugaler Dāsa, in the Calcutta University Manuscript Library, which is dated 1075 B. S., corresponding to 1668 A. D. (*vide* the copy numbered 1144). In the Amṛtarasāvalī, which in the above statement is given the fourth place in chronological order, there is also a reference to the Āgamasāra, thus—

আপনার তত্ত্ব তিঁহ লেখেন আপনে।
আগমসার গ্রন্থের মঙ্গলাচরণে ॥
তার তত্ত্ব শুনিতে যদি কারু লোভ হয়।
আগমসার দেখিলে পাবে তাহার নির্ণয় ॥
শিবদুর্গার বাক্য লয়্যা করাছে বর্ণন। P. 19.

From this statement we know that Āgamasāra was anterior to Amṛtarasāvalī,[1] and that the book was written in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and his wife Pārvatī. The Āgama Grantha named above is also, as we shall see presently, a book of this nature. Hence we are inclined to believe that this book is perhaps the Āgamasāra referred to in the Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī and Amṛtarasāvalī. A brief summary of the work is given below.

After the preliminary invocations the work practically begins thus—

শিবরহস্যাগমে যে কথা শুনিল।
পার্ব্বতীরে সদাশিব যে কথা কহিল ॥ etc.

[1] For further verifications, please see below.

This means that the author is, in this book, going to deal with a subject which was narrated by Śiva to Pārvatī about the mystic doctrine. They were then seated on the mountain of Kailāsa (the heaven of Śiva), when Pārvatī asked Śiva about the worship of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. Śiva said that Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa should not be considered as possessed of two separate bodies, for, in fact, they in union form an entity which is inseparable. Then follow discussions about the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndāvana, about the reasons of Kṛṣṇa's various incarnations in different ages, and about the birth of Rādhā and Virajā in the Vṛndāvana. In the Goloka, they lived in separate houses. One day a Sakhī (female friend) of Virajā came to the house of Rādhā, and found her engaged in love amours with Kṛṣṇa. She related the story to Virajā, who in grief melted into a river, but Kṛṣṇa rescued her. Then he punished both Rādhā and Virajā for their jealousy with the curse that they should become his Parakīyā wives in the Vṛndāvana.[1] What we mark here is that the Svakīyā wives of Kṛṣṇa in the Goloka are becoming his Parakīyā companions in the Vṛndāvana. This is an attempt to establish the superiority of the ideal of Parakīyā over that of the Svakīyā, and this, in the primary stage of the doctrine, was a necessity which the author could not reasonably avoid. The disciples of Caitanya had advanced philosophical arguments to transform the Parakīyā character of Rādhā to that of Svakīyā, but the Āgama Grantha seeks the opposite path. It brings down the Svakīyās to the standard of the Parakīyās, because this is the only ideal that the Sahajiyās

[1] There is also another version of this story in the Brahma-Vaivarta-Purāṇa, Chapter XLIX.

advocate. This shows how the Sahajiyā doctrine was going to be separated from the fold of Vaiṣṇavism with a different ideal.

The Ānanda-Bhairava

There is a copy of this book in the Calcutta University Manuscript Library, which bears the serial No. 3926. The manuscript is dated 1239 B. S., corresponding to 1832 A. D., and the author of the book is Prema Dāsa. It should be pointed out that the work mentions Āgamasāra as an earlier production—

পদ্মবতী কহে প্রভু করি নিবেদন।
আগমসার গ্রন্থ কহ শুনিতে হয় মন॥ P. 8.

The statement of the Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī (which we have noted above) to the effect that Āgamasāra was written before Ānandabhairava, is, therefore, supported by the internal evidence of this book also. After the preliminary verse of invocation the work begins in the form of a dialogue between a maiden named Padmāvatī, and a man named Śrīkānta. Padmāvatī asks him about the meaning of a verse of invocation, and in reply Śrīkānta offers a mystic interpretation saying that the culture of the mind cannot be explained by words of mouth, and that the common people cannot understand it—

বাহ্যে নাহি কহা যায় মনের করণ।
* * *
মায়ামোহী ভজন ইহা নারিবে বুঝিতে॥ P. 1.

And then he declares that this sort of culture has come down from remote antiquity—

এই মত সাধন ভজন পূর্ব্ব হইতে আছে। P. 1.

In support of this contention, he, then, offers a few illustrations—

1. Śakti took birth from the sweat of Brahman, and uniting with him produced Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. They had gone to practise austerities on the bank of a river, when Brahman went to them in the form of a dead body. Brahmā loathed it, but Viṣṇu offered three handfuls of water, while Śiva, who had known the secret by his power of meditation, embraced it and began to dance. This satisfied Brahman, who gave him (Śiva) Śakti as a reward. Śiva hesitated saying that he could not conscientiously accept the offer—

শিব কহে তোমার আজ্ঞা লঙ্ঘিব গোসাঞি।
এমন আজ্ঞা কর যাতে দোষের অন্ত নাই ॥ P. 2.

But Brahman told him that his hesitation was due to his not knowing who he (Brahman), Śakti, and he himself (Śiva) were. At this, the doubts of Śiva passed away, and he agreed to accept Śakti, who then advised him to adopt her in mystic culture for supreme spiritual realisation.[1]

আমার আজ্ঞা পালন তুমি করিবে সর্ব্বক্ষণে ॥
তোমার যে ইচ্ছা সেই ইচ্ছা হয় মোর।
বুঝিলে নিকট হয়, নহিলে হয় দূর ॥
তাহার লাগিয়া মোরে করহ ভজন ।
আমাকে জানিলে পাবে তার দরশন॥ P. 2.

When Śakti asked about the nature of the mystic worship—

মনে মনে বুঝ্যা দেখ উপাসনা কি ?

[1] Herein we find the germ of the Sahajiyā custom advocating the company of women for spiritual culture. The idea that Śakti is to be adopted for the sake of supreme knowledge is a most prominent characteristic of the Sahajiyā doctrine.

Śiva replied that he had adopted the mystic formula called Kāmabīj for the purpose—[1]

হর কহে কাম বীজের আশ্রয় হয়্যাছি ॥ p. 2.

Then Śiva asked for instruction both about the formal and the emotional culture [2] :—

হর কহে বাহ্য গুণ কহিবে আমারে।
অন্তরের গুণ কহ মন আছে স্থিরে ॥

Here Śakti introduced the topics of various Lotuses and Ponds in different parts of the body [3]—

সহস্রদল হয় মস্তক ভিতরে ।
অক্ষয় নামেতে তথা আছে সরোবরে ॥
উদর ভিতরে আছে মান সরোবর ।
তথা হৈতে ফুল গেল সহস্রদল উপর ॥ etc., pp. 2-3.

[1] In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta which is very popular with the Sahajiyās this Kāmabīj with Kāma-Gāyatrī is spoken of as appropriate formula to be used in mystic worship—

বৃন্দাবনে অপ্রাকৃত নবীন মদন ।
কামগায়ত্রী কামবীজে যার উপাসন ॥
মধ্য, ৮ পরিঃ ।

This idea has been much elaborated by the Sahajiyās, and a system of regular mystic spiritual culture in the company of women with the help of such mystic formula has been adopted by them, as we have pointed out in Chapter II.

[2] We have noted before the clause বাহ্যে নাহি কহা যায় মনের করণ which occurs in this book. This sort of differentiation between the formal and the emotional aspects of culture in the philosophical treatment of the doctrine has been adopted by the Sahajiyā writers, as we have pointed out in Chapter II.

[3] The subject of Lotuses and Ponds has been elaborately dealt with in books like the Amṛtaratnāvalī, Dehanirṇaya, etc.

At the end of this discourse, Śakti passed into a state of death, and this was repeated 108 times, each time Hara taking a bone out of her—

এই কথা কহিতে শক্তির মৃত্যু হইল।
চন্দ্রগুণে বিহ্বল হর ললাটে পড়িল॥
এই মত জন্ম মৃত্যু এক শত আটবার।
একশত আট বারে নিল একশত আট হাড়॥

p. 3.

With these 108 pieces of bones Hara formed a garland. Then came Brahmā and Viṣṇu to him, and they enquired what religion he was following in that fashion. Hara replied that he was worshipping Ādyā-Śakti or the Primeval Nature :—[1]

ব্রহ্মা কহে কার তুমি জাজন কর ধর্ম্ম।
হর কহে বুঝে দেখ যাহা হইতে জন্ম॥
আগ্যাশক্তি বিনে ইহা কদাচ না হয়।

p. 3.

Then Brahmā and Viṣṇu learnt the doctrine from Hara. Thus ends the first part of the first story. The second part begins thus : One day Hara and Śakti were sitting together, when Hara asked her where she

[1] This statement shows what is the aim of the Sahajiyā doctrine. The nature of a man with which he is born, or more properly that which produces his individuality, should be the object of culture, so that the natural tendencies may die a thousand deaths, each time leaving an impression in the mind. The collected experiences of such deaths can put a man on sound spiritual footing. This is what is called death in life (জিয়ন্তে মরা), and the garland of bones round the neck of Siva is symbolical of his experiencing such spiritual deaths ; he is, therefore, often mentioned as a typical Sahajiyā.

had been so long, for he could not find her in the whole world even by the force of his meditation—

একদিন হর শক্তি বসি একাসনে।
হর পুছে শক্তি তুমি ছিলে কোন স্থানে॥
যোগবলে চৌদ্দভুবন আমার গোচর।
ধ্যানে না পাইলাম তোমায় ভুবন ভিতর॥

p. 3.

Śakti replied that she can be known, not by meditation, but by mystic realisation [1]—

আদ্যাশক্তি কহে তুমি পাসরিলে সব।
মিছা ধ্যান যোগ কর নাহি অনুভব॥

p. 3.

Then she spoke about a mystic land called Guptacandrapura where, in the centre of a six-petalled lotus, reside a man and a woman with six damsels on six petals—

অখণ্ড ভুবন মধ্যে গুপ্তচন্দ্র গ্রাম।
চলাচল নাহি সেই হয় নিত্যধাম॥

*　　*　　*

পদ্ম মধ্যে আছে নাএক আর এক নাইকা।
ছয় দলে হয় জনা, আমি চন্দ্ররেখা॥

p. 3.

Saying this she, with Śiva, passed into a state of swoon, and went to that mystic land where they saw everything. There Śakti explained that it was she who manifested herself in both the animate and the inanimate

[1] It is for this reason that all kinds of religious formalities, austerities, Yoga, and meditation, etc., are discarded by the Sahajiyās.

objects in the form of a hidden potent Force supplying energy to the organs of vision, hearing, touch, smell, etc.[1]—

নীলচন্দ্র রেখা কহে আমা হৈতে সব।
আমার অঙ্গ আমার স্থিতি আমার অনুভব॥
আমার রূপ গুণ বৈশে নয়ানকামার আখে।
নয়ানকামা হৈতে দেখে জগতের লোকে॥
আমি নীলচন্দ্ররেখা আর অচেতন।
আমা হৈতে সচেতন হয় জগজ্জন॥ etc.
pp. 3-4.

When Śiva and Śakti came back to their senses, the latter manifested herself in her full potentialities—

এক এক গুণে কৈল একেক প্রকৃতি।
হরকে ভজএ সভে ভাব উপপতি॥
শক্তি জানে রসতত্ত্ব আর জানে শঙ্করে।
সহজ বস্তু আস্বাদিল কুচনি নগরে॥ p. 4.

Here ends the first story of the second part. Then Padmāvatī asked who else had known this culture—

পদ্মাবতী কহে ইহা আর জানে কে ?

and in reply Srīkānta narrated the second story which runs thus—

In this world there was a land called Candrakalā-grāma where lived one Candraketu by name. He was the son of a king and possessed many qualities, which attracted the mind of Pārvatī who taught him

[1] The practical realisation of the working of this potent Force is the principal aim of the mystic culture of the Sahajiyās.

Sahajiyā culture by means of an illustration of eight Nāyikās, thus—

In the Sahajapura-grāma there was a king named Hari-Nārāyaṇa. He had a minister named Bhairava who was the worshipper of Kālī. One day he swooned while in prayer, but was soon revived by Kālī. He had a very unique experience in that swoon about which he asked Kālī, who advised him to go to Candrakalā-grāma with five companions to be taught by eight Nāyikās. Accordingly, he went there with five persons, and sat on the bank of a pond. Seven out of the eight girls came there to bathe in the pond, and one of the men uttered the word "Hari." The girls began to discuss about the meaning of this word, but they could not come to any decision, and at last left the place to put the matter to Sulocanā who had remained at home. The men also followed them, and went to the abode of Sulocanā, who gave them shelter and food for the night, promising to explain the meaning afterwards. Then a discussion followed about the meaning of the term "Hari" which, Sulocanā said, meant the Supreme Being who can charm the whole universe, and supply perpetual enjoyment of pure bliss. This teaching went deep into the heart of the six men, who then returned to their abode and made exertions for the realisation of that bliss about which they had heard from the girl.

The topic then reverts to the discussion of Śrīkānta and Padmāvatī, the former saying that this religion was first adopted by Bharata, then came Kṛṣṇa, Vidyāpati, Caṇḍīdāsa, Jayadeva, Nityānanda and others.

The aim of the book is to establish the ideal of practical culture in the company of women. The Ānanda-bhairava is the first Sahajiyā work written on the philosophy of such practical culture.

Amṛtaratnāvalī.

We have a few copies of this book in the Calcutta University manuscript library, and it is also available in printed form due to the activities of the Baṭtalā presses of Calcutta. The book is popularly ascribed to Mukunda Dāsa. Though the work does not expressly refer to Ānandabhairava as an earlier production, yet it deals with the topics of Sarvadevā, of the eight Nāyīkās (two of whom are called Sulocanā and Sulakṣaṇā), and of Sahajapura, and Candrakānti-grāma, about which we have already heard in the Ānandabhairava. Relying on the statement of the Nīgūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī, we can, therefore, say that it was posterior to Ānandabhairava.

The work mostly deal with the subjects of spiritual technicalities. It begins with a discussion about the nature of Rasa, Rati, Rūpa, and Rāga, and shows hwo they are inter-related. Then we find how a worshipper should pass through the different stages of spiritual culture. At first he should be initiated before a Guru, and act according to his advice. He should recite the Mantras received from his spiritual guide at the time of initiation, and perform various pious acts under the guidance of the Guru. Āsakti (religious tendency) will thus grow in his mind, which will gradually lead to Rāga and Prema (deep divine love). Then the author lays stress upon the knowledge of human body, without which, he asserts, nothing can be performed in the sphere of mystic culture. Here we are introduced to the psycho-physiological system of the human body. We hear of the four corners of the body guarded by deer. Then there are topics of various nerves, lotuses and ponds, of

Paramātmā living in the Akṣaya-Pond over the head, of male and female elements in every body, of Sahajapura, Sadānandagrāma, Candrakāntipuragrāma, of eight Nāyikās, and similar subjects. The work thus deals with various matters of spiritual significance which are important features of the modern Sahajiyā doctrine. The Amṛtaratnāvalī is the first Sahajiyā book dealing elaborately with the subject of the gradual development of emotions under the guidance of the Guru, and with the psycho-physiological system of the human body on Tāntric model.

Amṛtarasāvalī.

Summary.

There was a lotus pond about 8 *Krośa* (16 miles) away from the bank of a river. The pond contained red lotuses in bloom, whose honey flowing in stream and passing over this long distance fell into the great river. The pond was in the keeping of one called Sarvadevā, who appointed five archers to guard it. He had also a band of nine followers under the leadership of one called Savā. One day this Savā and his nine lieutenants went to steal the essence of lotuses grown in the pond. They crossed the river, and entered the pond when the darkness of night had just set in. Savā was there made a captive, but his nine associates turned back. At dawn Savā was released; in fact his captivity was due to his not knowing himself owing to the influence of Māyā or ignorance. With the dawn of consciousness, the bondage of Māyā was cut asunder, and he was brought back to the realisation of his own nature. In the meantime, the nine followers of Savā, sorry for his loss, confined themselves at home. Sarvadevā came

there one day, and called for Savā, but on being informed that he was lost, he ordered the nine followers to find him out on pain of death. They searched for him without success, and at last became ascetics on the bank of a river. One day a beautiful girl came to bathe in that river. Her beauty captivated the heart of all the ascetics, and one among them followed her, while the remaining eight stayed there as before. The girl was going before the man, but he swooned when he looked behind. He was, however, revived by the girl, taken to her abode, and called by the name of Bharata. Now, to return to the topics of the nine ascetics. One day Savā revealed himself to them in human form. Thereupon three, out of the eight ascetics, went to Sarvadevā to inform him about the return of Savā. He came forthwith, and asked Savā to return to his service, but he refused. Thereupon he went back with the three ascetics who had gone to inform him about the return of Savā, while the remaining five ascetics stayed with Savā on the bank of the river. Here he established perfect concord among them. The girl again came to bathe in the river, and this time she was followed by all the six. When she found that she was thus being followed, she turned to a side of the road, but the men stood motionless. At this she went home in all haste and sent Bharata to bring the men to her house. He came, revived the men, but when he learnt that they were the men of Sarvadevā, he retreated to a dense forest instead of going to the abode of the girl. When the girl found that the men were not turning up, she herself went to them and conducted them to her own abode, and lodged them for the night in the beautiful garden of the out-house. There she sent her six female companions to test them. They came and spoke about

the Sahajiyā doctrine, maintaining that the first thing necessary is the knowledge of one's own self, and that success depends upon a man's adopting the nature of a woman. This discourse convinced the men, and the girls left them towards the close of the night. They were afterwards admitted into the inner apartment where they enjoyed Supreme Bliss.

The Amṛtarasāvalī deals with the higher aspect of the Sahajiyā doctrine. It was written on the principle of awakening spiritual consciousness by the culture of one's own self, and the subject has been treated here in the form of interesting allegories, the significance of which will be quite clear from the explanations given below.

Explanations.

Gaurī Dās in his Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī says that Sarvadevā is Paramātmā (Supreme Soul), and Savā is his offspring, the Individual Soul—

সর্ব্বদেবা পরমাত্মা কন্দর্প মোহন।

Also সর্ব্বদেবার অঙ্গে হৈল সভার জনম।

About the nine associates of Savā, it is said that five of them are the organs of knowledge, while the other four are the organs of work—

জ্ঞানেন্দ্রিয় পঞ্চ আর কর্ম্মেন্দ্রিয় চারি॥
একাদশ ইন্দ্রিয় মধ্যে গুহ্যেন্দ্রিয় নাহি লাগে।
ইহা বিনে দশেন্দ্রিয় কহে মহাভাগে॥

About the five archers who were appointed to guard the lotus pond, it is said that they represent the five arrows of Kāma (Attraction)—

কন্দর্পের পঞ্চবাণ রক্ষক সে হয়।

About the beautiful girl who came to bathe in the river, it is said that she personifies Rūpa (Divine Beauty)—

রূপে রূপে মঞ্জরী সভার শ্রেষ্ঠ হয়।

One of the nine ascetics who first followed the girl and was afterwards named Bharata is Mana (Mind)—

কন্যাসঙ্গে মন গেল তাহাই কহিল।

The six damsels who went at the bidding of the chief girl to test the six ascetics in the garden of the out-house during the night, are the six qualities of Rūpa, Rasa, Gandha, Sparśa, Śabda and Vilāsa, named in the Amṛtarasāvalī as—

নয়নকামা বয়নকামা শ্রবণ লতিকা।
গন্ধকালি স্পর্শমালি নীলচন্দ্ররেখা ॥

The Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī offers the following explanations of the significance of these names—

রসের গুণে রসমঞ্জরী বয়ান নিশ্চয়।
বয়ানকামা বলি দেখ গ্রন্থমধ্যে কয় ॥
শব্দগুণে রতি মঞ্জরী শ্রবণ অধিকা।
এই হেতু কহিলেন শ্রবণ লতিকা ॥
গন্ধগুণে রঙ্গমঞ্জরী নাসিকা প্রধান।
এই হেতু কহিলেন গন্ধকালি নাম ॥

Five of them are, therefore, the five qualities of eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin, the five organs of knowledge, while the sixth represents Vilāsa, as stated in—

রসস্থানে চন্দ্ররেখা বিলাস মঞ্জরী।
নীলচন্দ্ররেখা বলি কহিলা বিচারি ॥

Bereft of allegories the work imparts the following teachings.

The individual Soul is a spark of the Supreme Soul. It is by nature free, but enters into bondage owing to its connection with Māyā. Being of divine origin it naturally longs for nectar, indicated here by the honey of the lotuses. Once going to taste it by stealth, it realised its own nature as soon as it became free from the influence of the senses. The work is very clear on this point when it speaks of the release of Savā from captivity—

তাহাকে ছাড়িয়া দিল আপনার গুণে।
মিছামিছি বন্দী আছে আপনা না জানে॥
কত যুগ বহি গেল নাহিক চেতন।
ছায়ারূপে মায়া পিশাচ করয়ে দণ্ডন॥
নিত্যানন্দ চাঁদ যবে উদয় করিল।
বাহ্য ও মনের আন্ধার দুই দূরে গেল॥
চৈতন্যচাঁদের গুণ কে কহিতে পারে।
চেতন করান তারে চৈত্য রূপেতে॥
মায়াধন্ধ দূরে গেল পাইল চেতন।
নিজ কার্য্য মনে স্মৃতি হৈল ততক্ষণ॥

But this does not speak of the normal state of things, for the dawn of consciousness without culture can fall in the lot of only a limited few. The Nigūḍhārtha-prakāśāvalī explains the significance of this stealing thus—

চুরি করিতে গেল তার কথা কহি।
সাধন নহিল দেহ হইল নিশ্চয়ি॥

The work, therefore, deals with the principles of regular culture. In the sphere of this mystic training, the inner organs of consciousness are ignored, while

the physical organs of knowledge, as indicated by Savā's five associates remaining with him, are to be trained. The work says that Savā is by nature free, but he cannot advance on the path of spirituality, because of his connection with the five senses—

যথা আছে সেই কন্যা তিঁহ তাহা জানে।
যাইতে না পারে তথা সঙ্গে পঞ্চ জনে॥
নির্ব্বিকার না হইলে যাইতে না পারে।
বিকার থাকিতে গেলে যাবা মাত্র মরে॥
তিঁহ হন নির্ব্বিকার তাঁর বিকার নাই।
পাঁচ জন সঙ্গে রহে তেঁঞি নাহি যাই॥

Then what is to be done? The senses should be trained, and kept under perfect control,—

পঞ্চ জনে কত দিনে করিলা সমান।
ছয় জনার এক বাক্য একই পরাণ·

This sort of agreement between self and the organs is a necessary condition for spiritual advancement. This done, the sight of divine beauty (Rūpa) enchants the soul, and when from that source comes the animation of the spirit, the object is attained, and the final entry into the abode of spiritual bliss is accomplished. This is the nature of Sahajiyā culture as taught by the Amṛta-rasāvalī, in which we have a brief summary of the doctrine expressed in the following terms—

বাহ্যের আন্ধার মনের আন্ধার
দুই কৈল নাশ।
নাশ হইলে তিঁহ করেন প্রকাশ॥
রসপ্রেম জন্মাইয়া মুর্ত্তিমান কৈল।
সেই কালে শ্রীরূপ আসি দরশন দিল॥

কি কুক্ষণে দেখিলাম তারে আকুল করিল মোরে
ধরে প্রাণ নাই সেই হইতে।
আকাশে তাঁহার গুণ মুখে বাক্য নাহি কন,
ভয় নাই মায়ারে বধিতে ॥
রসগুণে রস বশ অতি বড় কর্কশ
জীবন থাকিতে হৈল মরা ॥
অন্তরে প্রেমাঙ্কুর বাহ্যে অতি কঠোর
যার হয় সেই জন সারা ॥ etc.

The same teaching is also embodied in the Ānanda-bhairava. We find there that one Bhairava was deputed with five persons to learn the doctrine from the girls of Candrakalāgrāma. The following description of these five persons are given in the book—

ব্রাহ্মণ পণ্ডিত সঙ্গে লৈবে একজন ॥
আর দুই সঙ্গে লবে বৈষ্ণব পণ্ডিত।
একজন মনুষ্য নিবে শাস্ত্রের রহিত ॥
আর একজন নিবে যারে বলে মন্দ।

Their names are—

গঙ্গাদাস বিষ্ণুদাস বৈষ্ণব পণ্ডিত।
শ্রীধর নামেতে হয় শাস্ত্রের রহিত ॥
বিদ্যানিধি নামে হয় ব্রাহ্মণ পণ্ডিত।
বিজয়রাম নামে হয় কথা বিপরীত ॥

In the Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī the following explanation is given of the significance of these names—

ব্রাহ্মণ পণ্ডিত বিদ্যানিধি তার নাম।
বদনচন্দ্র এই জন জানিবে বিধান ॥
বৈষ্ণব পণ্ডিত দেখ দুই জনে।
গঙ্গাদাস জিহ্বা, বিষ্ণুদাস নয়নে ॥

মনুষ্য শ্রীধর শ্রবণ সেই হয়।
মূর্খ বিজয়রাম নাসা যারে কয়॥
এই পঞ্চ আর ভৈরব শুদ্ধা ছয়।
জ্ঞান ইন্দ্রিয় লৈয়া করিলা বিজয়॥

So, the training of the organs of knowledge is also meant here.

In the Ānandabhairava, the girls are named as—

সুলোচনা সুলক্ষণা সুচিত্রা সুধামুখী।
কনকলতা হেমলতা কাঞ্চনলতা অলকলতা সখী॥

The Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī says—

অষ্টদলে অষ্ট নায়িকা এই এক কহে।
অমৃত রসাবলীতে নাম ফের হয়ে॥

So, they are the same girls mentioned in the Amṛtarasāvalī under different names. The only difference is that only six of them are brought into play in that book.

In the preliminary discourses of the Āgamasāra, the same eight elements are also mentioned under the names of শ্বেত, কন্যা, রক্ত, মেধা, কমলা, শশধর, etc. The Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī says—

আগমসার মঙ্গলাচরণে কয়।
সে পয়ার লিখিলাম জানিবে নিশ্চয়॥
আনন্দভৈরব বলি এক গ্রন্থ হয়।
তাহাতেই শ্বেতকন্যাদি লিখিলা নিশ্চয়॥
শ্বেতকন্যাদিকে নয়নকামাদি কয়।
আনন্দভৈরবে ইহা লিখিলা নিশ্চয়॥

So, the three books, Āgamasāra, Ānandabhairava, and Amṛatarasāvalī have worked on the same principle in this matter. This sort of agreement in these earlier

productions is very convincing. What we mark here is the high ideal of the doctrine which is free from the materialistic grossness of the later time. It is quite evident that the teachings of the Hindu philosophical works have been incorporated in these books, but what the Sahajiyās have adopted in this way, they have moulded with the stamp of their own religion by bringing in the topics of love, beauty, and bliss. The repeated references to girls as teachers of the mystic doctrine have strengthened the foundation of the belief in the utility of taking female companions in spiritual culture.

But the women are taken not for the pleasure of the senses, but for training them in an atmosphere of inspiring enjoyment, so that the soul may be fit to realise that supreme Bliss which is the very nectar of spirituality. The necessity of practical culture was advocated on this principle when the Sahajiyā doctrine first issued forth as an independent religion from the fold of Vaiṣṇavism. But the Vaiṣṇavas do not advocate this sort of practical culture, and this is the real difference which has separated, as we shall see presently, these two currents of religion. Let us now see if we can find any approximate date of this separation.

Date of separation.

Mukunda Deva is believed to be the author of the Amṛtarasāvalī, but on close inspection of the contents of the book, this does not seem to be absolutely correct. The writer, whoever he may be, says that he was instructed by Mukunda to write the book—

বন্দ গোসাঞি মুকুন্দ যাহা হইতে গেল ধন্ধ
দুই বস্তু যেই প্রকাশিল।
বাহ্যের সাধন মনের কারণ
সহজ বস্তু যেই লিখাইল ॥ p. 2.

Also বস্তু প্রকাশিব আমি যেই যেই হয়।
শ্রীমুকুন্দ লিখায়েছেন হইয়া সদয়॥ p. 3.

And শ্রীযুত মুকুন্দ আজ্ঞায় লিখিলাম আমি।
কতই দিবার কালে মানা কৈলেন তিনি॥ p. 23.

Thus, it is quite evident that the book was written by a disciple of Mukunda. The author narrates the following story of its composition—

কবিরাজ গোস্বামীকে যবে প্রভু কৃপা কৈল।
গ্রন্থবর্ণন কর তাহাকে কহিল॥
গোসাঞি কহেন মুঞি করি নিবেদন।
মোর শক্তি এই গ্রন্থ না যায় বর্ণন॥
নিতাই কহেন তুমি ভরষা কর মনে।
চৈতন্য লিখাবেন তোরে আসিয়া আপনে॥
তাঁহার আজ্ঞায় কৈল গ্রন্থের চিন্তন।
যে লিখাইল নিতাই, তাহা করিল লিখন॥
তার মধ্যে এক বস্তু পাইল সার।
প্রকাশ করিতে বাঞ্ছা হইল তাঁহার॥
তাহা লাগি ষড়তত্ত্ব করিল প্রচার।
নিষেধ করিল নিতাই না লিখিল আর॥
ভক্তিকল্পলতিকাতে দেখ বিচার কর‍্যা।
সহজ ভাঙ্গিতে প্রভু কলম নিল কাড়্যা॥
চৈতন্যচরিতামৃতে সহজ সংক্ষেপে লিখিল।
জীবের ডরে গোসাঞি জিউ লিখিয়া ঢাকিল॥
জীবের মনে সহজ বস্তু সামান্য জ্ঞান হবে।
সামান্য হইলে জীব অধোগতি যাবে॥
প্রেমরত্নাবলীতে সহজ ভাঙ্গিতে।
অচৈতন্য হৈয়া তিঁহ পড়িল মূর্চ্ছাতে॥

দিবা রাত্রি বয়্যা গেল কিছুই না জানে।
আপনে নিতাই আসি কহিলা স্বপনে ॥
দেখিয়া তাহার দশা আজ্ঞা কৈল তারে।
সহজ বস্তু পৃথক করি করহ প্রচারে ॥
তবে শ্রীরূপের ঠাঞি আজ্ঞা মাগি নিলা।
যেই বাঞ্ছা হয় লেখ আজ্ঞা তারে দিলা ॥
চৈতন্যের গূঢ়তত্ত্ব স্বরূপ গোসাঞি জানে।
রঘুনাথে শিখাইলা করিয়া যতনে।
সেই রঘুনাথ দাস ইহারে কৃপা কৈল।
কৃপা আজ্ঞা পাঞা গোসাঞি মুকুন্দ লিখিল ॥
মুকুন্দ দেব তবে গোসাঞির আজ্ঞা পাঞা।
সহজ বস্তু লিখিলেন সংস্কার করিয়া ॥
সেই পুঁথি দয়া কর‍্যা দিলেন আমারে।
সংস্কার বুঝিতে নার‍্যা ফিরে দিলাম তারে ॥
তবে মুকুন্দ দেব বুঝিয়া মোর মন।
সংস্কার ভাঙ্গিয়া তাহা করিলা লিখন ॥
মোর হাতে কলম দিয়া লেখাইল আপনে।
বাহ্যের করণ নহে মনের করণে ॥
গোসাঞি মুকুন্দ বলেন সহজ বস্তু বলি।
শ্লোকার্থ ভাঙ্গিয়া দিয়া লিখহ সকলি ॥ pp. 3-4.

The author here states that the mystic nature of the divine love of Caitanya was known to Svarūpa who communicated this to Raghunāth, from whom Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj learnt the secret. When he was thinking of writing a book on this subject, he conceived the idea of the Sahajiyā doctrine, and was very eager to write on this cult also. But fearing that people would not understand its true significance, he sparingly touched upon the doctrine in his Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, Premaratnāvalī and Bhaktikalpa-latikā. His mind, however, did not rest in peace, and

at last he received inspiration from Nityānanda to give a clear exposition to the Sahajiyā doctrine. This permission he transferred to Mukunda who wrote a book on this cult. But as it was somewhat difficult for the common people to grasp its meaning, the Amṛtarasāvalī was written under the guidance of Mukunda by one of his disciples. Mukunda perhaps wrote a book on the Sahajiyā doctrine in Sanskrit, as can be guessed from the expression শ্লোকার্থ ভাঙ্গিয়া দিয়া লিখহ সকলি. The work under discussion here was perhaps written on the model of that original work.

According to the author of this book also, Mukunda Deva is one of the earliest writers on the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā cult. As it appears that Mukunda was a disciple of Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj who died sometime during the closing years of the 16th century A.D., the date of the composition of the Amṛtarasāvalī, and of the Amṛtaratnāvalī also, was not far removed from this period. The Āgamasāra and the Ānandabhairava were a little earlier than this time. Relying on the testimony of the Amṛtarasāvalī and Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī, we can, therefore, conclude that the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal first issued forth as an independent branch from the fold of Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism towards the beginning of the seventeenth century A.D.

We can even come nearer to an approximate date in another way. Rasakadamba is a Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava work which was written by one who bore the title of Kavi-Vallabha. The author has definitely stated that the work was finished in 1520 Śaka, corresponding to 1598 A.D.[1] By close inspection of the contents of

[1] The work has been published by the Baṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad, Calcutta, and I have also given a summary of the book in my

the book we find that it was written when the Sahajiyā doctrine was going to be formed as a separate cult. Kavi-Vallabha has preached the ideal of Sahaja love maintaining that pure love is only known to those who follow the mode of culture which is based on Anurāga.[1] About this Anurāga, the author says that all the love which a youngman feels for his wife, all the affection which a doting mother feels for her child,—in a word, all the secular passions of a person should be spiritualised and bestowed on God-head, and then only will the higher mystic love be achieved.[2] The work further states that in the culture of love, men should adopt the nature of women for the sake of enjoying their own self,[3] an idea which is the basic principle of the Sahajiyā doctrine also. In uttering the praises of Kṛṣṇa, Rukmiṇī says—" All the sages think of you with love after giving up austere practices such as Japa, Tapa and Yoga, but kindly tell me about your

" An Introduction to the Study of the Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā Cult," pp. 142-162. About the date of composition the author says :—

বিংশতি অধিক পঞ্চদশ শত শক।
তখন রচিল রসকদম্ব পুস্তক ॥

1 অনুরাগ অনুযায়ী যাহার ভজন।
নির্ম্মল আসক্তিভাব বুঝে সেইজন ॥ p. 16.

2 পত্নী প্রতি যত স্নেহ করে কামিগণ।
সেই প্রেম করিলে সে লভে প্রেম ধন ॥
পুত্র প্রতি যত স্নেহ করয়ে জননী।
সেই স্নেহ কৃষ্ণে হৈলে ভজন বাখানি ॥ p. 82.

3 মানসে প্রকৃতি হঞা রমায় আপনা।
And শক্তিতে আসক্তি করে সখীভাব করি।
Also বিনে শক্তিবশে নহে কৃষ্ণরস পান। pp. 43-44.

Sahaja manifestation which is mystic in nature, and explain who you are, where you dwell, and what gives you joy."[1] The use of the term Sahaja in this connection is quite significant. The author also refers to an ever-permanent place called Nitya-Sthāna, and of a heaven called Nitya-Vṛndāvana where Kṛṣṇa tastes the pleasure of Rati by hiding himself among the Gopīs.[2] That the custom of the practical culture of Rati was in vogue at that time is quite evident from the remark that the practice was held in derision by the people who could place no faith in the theory that a man can ever adopt the nature of a woman.[3] Though this is a clear indication of the existence of the Sahajiyā Culture towards the latter part of the 16th century A.D., yet there are evidences to show that the doctrine as it is practised now was simply going to be formed at that time. The modern Sahajiyās hold fast to the ideal of Parakīyā, but the doctrine preached in the Rasakadamba is definitely based on the Svakīyā ideal. We have already shown that in

1 সকল তপস্বী মেলি জপ, তপ, যোগ ছাড়ি
প্রেমরস সঘনে খিয়ায় ॥
আপন সহজ যশ কহিতে নিগূঢ় রস
যদি মোকে দাসী বুদ্ধি ধর।
কে তুমি কোথাতে স্থিতি কোন ভাবে সুখমতি
কপট ভাঙ্গিয়া স্থির কর। p. 30.

2 নিত্য বৃন্দাবনে কৃষ্ণ গোপিনী সঙ্গতি।
প্রকৃতিতে গুপ্ত হৈয়া ভোগ করে রতি ॥ p. 64.

3 দেখিতে না দেখে কেহ ভজিতে না ভজে ॥
রতি নাম শুনি তারা উপহাসে দহে।
পুরুষের প্রকৃতি ভাব এহো সত্য নহে ॥ p. 66.

speaking of the nature of pure emotion the author has advocated the ideal of love as it exists between a husband and his wife, which is thus of the Svakīyā character, but this is not the only instance in which the writer has expressed himself in this way. He further states that Kṛṣṇa brought Rukmiṇī and Satyabhāmā, his two married wives, together, and taught them the formula of mystic culture imbued with the emotion of Kaiśora. Kṛṣṇa became the Guru, and his two queens were his disciples, both of whom ultimately attained to the perfection of love by culturing emotions in the company of Kṛṣṇa.[1] This is a strong advocacy of the Svakīyā ideal, and it is for this reason that Rasakadamba has been ignored by the later Sahajiyās. The book was written when the creed of the doctrine was not definitely formed. It was a work of the transitional period when the Sahajiyā doctrine was going to be evolved as an independent cult from the fold of Vaiṣṇavism. Kavi-Vallabha has simply made an attempt to put forth an ideal for adoption, but the later Sahajiyās ignored the Svakīyā ideal, and held fast to Parakīyā, on the basis of which the modern Sahajiyā doctrine has been formed. It is for this reason that no reference to Rasakadamba is found in the modern Sahajiyā literature. What we mark here is that the Parakīyā ideal was not

[1] দোহাকে কিশোর রসে মন্ত্র শিখাইলা ॥
আপনে হইলা গুরু শিষ্য দুই নারী ।
দীক্ষা করাইলা মহা মন্ত্র অধিকারী ॥
And কৃষ্ণস্থানে জানিল রুক্মিণী সত্যভামা ।
কিশোরের ভাবে তারা হৈলা কৃষ্ণ প্রেমা ॥
কৃষ্ণ অঙ্গে করে তারা কিশোরের ভাব ।
প্রতিদিন বাড়ল নবীন প্রেমলাভ ॥ pp. 81, 82.

definitely formed even in 1598 A.D., and this proves that the modern Sahajiyā doctrine did not take its proper shape before that date.

Differentiating characteristics of the two faiths.

Though the modern Sahajiyā cult is thus an offshoot of Vaiṣṇavism, what is the reason that the Sahajiyās are disowned by the orthodox Vaiṣṇavas, and why do the Sahajiyās themselves speak of diverging from the main current? These are questions which have been satisfactorily answered in the Post-Caitanya Sahājiyā literature. In the Vivarta-Vilāsa it is said that Jīva Goswāmī discarded the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta for the following reasons—

(জীব) সক্রোধে কহেন ওহে শুন কৃষ্ণদাস ॥
ব্যাকতা (ব্যক্ত) করিয়া কেন ক।রলা বর্ণনে ।
পর্‌ক্রিয়া ভাব কেন কৈলে প্রকাশনে ॥
আমরা লিখিনু গ্রন্থ সংস্কার করিয়া ।
ধর্ম্ম প্রকাশিয়া তাহা রাখিলাম ঢাকিয়া ॥
বিত্তমান (বিদ্বান্) নহিলে কেহ নারিবে বুঝিতে ।
কঠিন প্রমাণ কেহ নারিবে পড়িতে ॥
এক এক শ্লোকের অর্থ শত শত ধারে ।
বর্ণিয়াছেন প্রভু রূপ করিয়া বিস্তারে ॥
গোপালচম্পক নামে গ্রন্থ মহাশূর ।
লিখিয়াছেন নিত্য লীলা যাহাতে প্রচুর ॥
ভাষা করি হেন গ্রন্থ করিতে জুয়ায় ?
এত কহি ক্রোধ কৈল জীব মহাশয় ॥ p. 21.

Firstly, the fault lies in the exposition of the Parakīyā doctrine in the Vernacular language. The works of the Goswāmīs also deal with the same subject, but they being written in Sanskrit are accessible only to those who are

versed in that language. Such books should not be written in the Vernacular, and why? Because—

তুমি যে লিখিলে, জীবে সম্ভব না হয়। p. 22.

"The ideal of such Parakīyā love is not possible for the common people to follow."

In the Amṛtarasāvalī, the same argument is advanced thus—

চৈতন্যচরিতামৃতে সহজ সংক্ষেপে লিখিল।
জীবের ডরে গোসাঞি জিউ লিখিয়া ঢাকিল ॥
জীবের মনে সহজবস্তু সামান্য জ্ঞান হবে।
সামান্য হইলে জীব অধোগতি যাবে ॥ p. 3.

"The common people, unable to grasp the higher significance of this spiritual love, will make improper use of this ideal, and much mischief will follow."

In the discourse of Caitanya and Rāmānanda, as narrated in the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta (Canto II, Chap. VIII) Caitanya Deva seems to have entertained the same kind of fear when he closed the mouth of Rāmānanda with the palm of his hand. It is also said that he used to hold secret meetings at the dead of night for the discussions of this sort of love with only a few of his most intimate followers, to which other disciples were not admitted.

Secondly, the Sahajiyās maintain, as we have seen in the last chapter as well as in the Ānandabhairava, that some sort of practical culture is necessary for the realisation of the divine love of Parakīyā complexion. They, therefore, take Parakīyā companions for the growth of this love, for the training of senses, and for bringing this complicated affair within the easy reach of even the most common people. We thus find that though the Sahajiyās and the Vaiṣṇavas do not materially differ so

far as the philosophy of their doctrine is concerned, yet what the latter advocate in theory, the former put into actual practice for the purpose of regular culture of love. It is for this reason that the theological works of both the sects mainly deal with the same matters, with this difference that in the Sahajiyā books there are references to the practical culture of love, while the Vaiṣṇavas simply adopt the ideal of Parakīyā in the conception of divine love.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HIGHER ASPECTS OF THE SAHAJIYĀ DOCTRINE.

A clear interpretation of the significance of the term Sahaja, as used to designate the doctrine of the Sahajiyās, is found in the Rūpānuga-Bhajana-Darpaṇa,[1] wherein it is observed :

সহজভজন এই শব্দের অর্থ এই যে জীব অনুচৈতন্যস্বরূপ আত্মা। প্রেম আত্মার সহজ ধর্ম্ম। যে ধর্ম্ম যে বস্তুর সহিত একত্রে উৎপন্ন হয় তাহা তাহার সহজ। p. 2, f. n.

This means that the human beings are subconscious personifications of the Supreme Soul, and that Love is a natural characteristic of the Supreme Being, which man possesses by virtue of his birth as a divine inheritance. The Sahajiyā doctrine, therefore, means the natural religion of the human soul aiming at the culture of Love spoken of as the quality with which one is born as a human being. In order to understand the fundamental principles of the Sahajiyā doctrine, we have, therefore, to enquire (*i*) about the origin of the human soul, (*ii*) about the inborn qualities which it possesses, and (*iii*) about Love regarded as its natural characteristic. Such preliminary investigations are absolutely necessary at this stage of our progress in order to enter into the spirit of the doctrine which the Sahajiyās have adopted by simplifying problems of intricate religious nature.

[1] A manuscript in the possession of Mr. Sajanīkānta Dās B.A. of the Pravāsī Office, Calcutta.

We are quite familiar with the Vedantic teaching that the individual soul is a spark of the Supreme Soul. The Chāndogya-Upaniṣad (6-9-2) has the well-known maxim "Tat Tvamasi," which means that the individual soul is by nature allied to the Supreme Soul. Another aphorism of this work (4-11-1), "So'haṃ asmi" (I am He), is also of this nature. The Muṇḍaka-Up. (3-3) teaches that Prāṇa is born from the Supreme Soul; and the unity of God and man is proclaimed in the Iśa-Up. (1-7). The Kaṭha-Up. (1-14, 3-12) asserts that God dwells in the hearts of all. This idea of individuality coming from the Supreme Being has also been adopted by the Sahajiyās. They, however, designate the Supreme Being by the terms Brahma, Hari, Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, Paramātmā according to convenience, and the individual soul by Jivātmā, Sabhā (or Savā), Jīva, etc. This idea about the special phraseology employed by the Sahajiyās will be helpful to grasp the sense of the quotations noted below.

The nature of human soul.

The Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī says—"Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Being who resides in the Vaikuṇṭha. When He experiences the desire of creation He casts a glance towards Māyā (Primeval Nature), and enters into her womb in the form of a spark. Thus man is born with Paramātmā encased in the body."[1] In the

1 পরম পুরুষ কৃষ্ণ বৈকুণ্ঠের পতি।
ইচ্ছা হৈলে তিঁহো চান মায়া প্রতি॥
গোলোক বৈকুণ্ঠ হৈতে করেন ইক্ষণ।
তেজরূপী পরমাত্মা প্রবেশ তখন॥
গর্ভাধান হয়, সহজ মানুষের জন্ম।
দেহে আসি পরমাত্মা হৈল অবতীর্ণ॥ p. 2.

Ātmā-Nirūpaṇa (U. MS. No. 2535) we have—"The Supreme Being is constantly present in this body of ours; in fact, the energy of God lies hidden within ourselves. He is like a burning furnace, and we, the individual souls, are like sparks from that blazing source. We are created from the energy of God."[1] The Rasatattva observes—"There are two beings in this body of ours, one of whom is called Paramātmā, and the other Jīvātmā, the former reigning over this mortal frame."[2]

The Vṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā maintains that production really begins as the result of the union of man and woman. The Supreme Being comes into the body as soon as it is formed, and then comes Māyā or Ignorance making us forget our divine inheritance.[3] So, it naturally

[1] এই দেহে সেই প্রভু সদা বিরাজমান।
* * * *
ঈশ্বরের শক্তি সেই জীবের হৃদয়ে।
স্বরূপের শক্তি সত্য ইহা মিথ্যা নহে॥
ঈশ্বরের শক্তি যেই জ্বলিত জ্বলন।
জীবেতে স্বরূপ যৈছে স্ফুলিঙ্গের কণ॥
* * * *
সেই শক্তিকণা তেঁহো হয় অগ্নিময়।
pp. 1-2.

[2] শরীরের মধ্যে আছে দুই মহাশয়।
জীবআত্মা বলি আর পরমাত্মা হয়॥
শরীরের রাজা এই পরমাত্মা গণি।
p. 2.

[3] জন্মের নিণয় তত্ত্ব শুনহ সাক্ষাতে॥
গর্ভে জন্ম মাতা পিতার বাসর বঞ্চনে।
রজ বিন্দুতে দেহ হয় শুক্র সন্নিধানে॥
* * * *

follows that if we can again arouse in ourselves the consciousness of our noble heritage, we can easily re-establish our connection with God. This is a spiritual truth of great significance.

The natural heritage of man.

We thus find that the Sahajiyās also believe that man is born with the spark of God, but he forgets his own divine origin due to the influence of Māyā. It is the common teaching of some philosophical works that though man is born with the essence of God, yet it is illusion, indiscrimination and attachment that separate him from God, and bind him in the bondage of the world (Sāṃkhya, 6-16 ; Yoga, 2-24, etc.), from which he can be released by spiritual knowledge (Chānd.-Up., 7-1-3 ; Kaṭha-Up., 2-2-12 ; Sāṃkhya, 1-104 ; Yoga, 2-26 ; Iśa-Up., 1-11, etc.). The Sahajiyās do not like to trouble themselves with intellectual speculations of various kind in order to find out the nature of this bondage, and the means of effecting the release, but they go direct to the simple truth that as man comes from God he possesses divine qualities in him, the full manifestation of which will make him resemble God, and bring about emancipation. In this way, they have followed the most natural course which is the easiest of all, and have simplified a very complicated problem, the solution of

দশ মাস পূর্ণ জীব ভূমিষ্ঠ হইল।
অকস্মাৎ নিজ প্রভু আসিয়া মিলিল ॥

*   *   *   *

তার পর বিষ্ণুমায়া আসিয়া বেড়িল।
কোথা প্রভু নিজ বস্তু সর্ব্ব পাসরিল ॥

p. 3.

Also জীবের বীজসূত্র পুরুষ প্রকৃতি।

Rasaratnasāra, p. 14.

which has taxed the brains of the best thinkers of all the religions of the world.

The inborn qualities of the soul.

In dealing with this matter the Sahajiyās, in the first place, maintain that by birth man gets a human form, but it is the development of the divine qualities in him that gives him the true character of a man. The Ratnasāra (U. MS. No. 1111) observes[1]—" All lives are created as the result of the union of the male and the female elements, and so are human beings also. Under a favourable opportunity God comes in the human body with all His natural characteristics, and the new form is nothing but a modified image of God, so man belongs to the family of God. However transformed may man be by virtue of his birth, the divine element in him cannot remain concealed, and those of them who manifest this divine character to its fullest extent are called gods. These god-like men are technically designated by the

[1] শৃঙ্গারেতে জন্ম হয় তত জীবগণ।
এই হেতু হয় যত মনুষ্যেরগণ ॥
দেহে আবির্ভূত হয় সময় পাইয়া।
দেহে আবির্ভূত হয় স্বভাবে আসিয়া ॥
জীব স্বভাব হয় মনস্ত দেহ পায়।
সমস্কার মানুস বলি সর্ব্ব শাস্ত্রে কয় ॥
এই মত মনুস্ত ঈশ্বর জ্ঞাতিগণ।
লুকাইতে নাহি পারে স্বভাব কারণ ॥
* * * *
ঈশ্বর স্বভাব যদি মনস্ত স্বভাব হয়।
স্বভাবের গুণে তারে ঈশ্বর কহয় ॥
* * * *
স্বতসিদ্ধ মানুস তারে জানিহ নিশ্চয় ॥
pp. 180-181.

Sahajiyās by the term Svatasiddha as well as by Śuddhasattva and Sahaja, etc."

The author here speaks of the Svatasiddha men only, and this naturally leads us to the enquiry—what other kinds of men there are from whom they have been so singled out? It is said that the human beings are principally divided into two classes—(*i*) those who are naturally free, and (*ii*) those who are bound in the bondage of the world—

Men classified.

সেই জীবগণ হয় দুইত প্রকার।
নিত্য মুক্তগণ হয়, নিত্যবদ্ধ আর॥
নিত্য মুক্ত জীব হয় যত দেবগণ।
ব্রহ্মা ইন্দ্র আদি যত অসংখ্য গণন॥
নিত্য বদ্ধ জীব যেই কৃষ্ণে বহির্মুখ॥

(U. MS. No. 564, p. 5.)

And—

সেই জীবগণ হয় দুই মত প্রকার।
এক মুক্ত নিত্য, আর যুক্ত সংসার॥

Ratnasāra, p. 182.

We thus find that gods like Brahmā, Indra and others are naturally free. Those among us who can resemble them in perfection are, therefore, god-like persons of the first class, and they, but not those of the other class who being concentered all in self are attached to worldly things, are the ideal beings of the Sahajiyās. It is in the men of the first class that divine qualities are found developed to their fullest extent. Now, what are these qualities the development of which imprints on men the character of God? This enquiry will lead to the natural characteristics of the ideal Sahaja man.

The qualities of the Śuddhasattva men are as follows :

Characteristics of Sahaja man.

They are always full of devotion, and to them the difference between self and the rest of the world vanishes to nothingness ; they are also not at all attached to worldly things. As they are always true to their conscience, they cannot be troubled with the discrimination of what is right and what is wrong. They envy none, and have their hearts always full of profound peace.[1]

It is further stated that they do not even covet a residence in heaven, for they care very little for their own welfare. They consider themselves the humblest of the humble like a straw, so to speak, and so they never assume an air of superiority over others. They think themselves servants of God, and are always unconcerned at harms done to them, like a tree sheltering the striker while receiving strokes of axe from him.[2]

[1] শুদ্ধসত্ত্ব জীব যেই সদা নিষ্ঠাশীল।
সহজে অভেদভাবে দেখে যে অখিল॥
বিষয়ের দাস্তে যেই না কাটায় কাল।
নয়নের দৃষ্টি যার চিত্তে চিরকাল॥
ভাল মন্দ নাহি জানে, নাহি করে দ্বেষ।
অন্তরে নিয়ত হেরে আপন মহেশ॥

Rasaratnasāra, p. 6.

[2] নিজসুখ লাগি সালক্যাদি না করে গ্রহণে।
নিজ ভাল মন্দ তারা কিছুই না জানে॥
সর্ব্বজনে উত্তম দেখে আপনাকে হীন।
কৃষ্ণের দাসের দাস আমি, এই অভিমান॥
তৃণের সমান সেই আপনাকে মানে।
কাটিলে না বলে কিছু যেন তরুগণে॥

U. MS. No. 564, pp. 6, 7, 11.

The narration of the qualities of those who are termed Sthitaprajña (men of undisturbed temperament) in the Gītā (2-55-61) is somewhat of this nature. In the Vivarta-Vilāsa it is stated that only those who are of stable nature can understand this doctrine of human perfection.[1] It is further said that men of unstable character are really the untouchable, and they are despised by the whole world.[2] We thus find that great stress is laid on the mental equilibrium of men, as signified by the term Sthitaprajña used in the Gītā. The Rativilāsapaddhati, however, says—"Those who are Svatasiddha (or saintly by nature) live in the ideal land of Vṛndāvana which is illuminated with all brilliance. The minds of these men cannot rest circumscribed within the limit of creation. They are somewhat extraordinary in nature, and neither material nor immaterial propensities can be ascribed to them. They are men of pure love, and so it is said that they resemble the Supreme Being."[3]

[1] স্থায়ীভাবে অনুভব যাহার হইবে।
মানুষ করণ সেই বুঝিতে পারিবে ॥
p. 74.

[2] অস্থির স্বভাবে অশুচি, জগত নিন্দিত।
Rativilāsa-P., p. 20.

[3] স্বতঃসিদ্ধ বৃন্দাবন ভূমি সদা দীপ্তিবতী।
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ লোক দেখ তাহাতে বসতি ॥
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ মানস নহে সৃষ্টির ভিতরে।
এই লক্ষণ সার কহে গ্রন্থকারে ॥
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ মানুষ অপূর্ব্ব সবা হৈতে।
প্রাকৃতাপ্রাকৃত ভাব না পারি কহিতে ॥
বিশুদ্ধসত্ত্যপ্রেম মনুষ্যগণ যত।
অতএব গোলোকনাথ তাহাতে আশ্রিত ॥ p. 34.

The characteristics of love.

Here we are introduced to the topic of love which is spoken of as an attribute of God as well as of the Svatasiddha or Śuddhasattva man, but this love cannot grow in a man unless he has attained to a state of perfection which is beyond the influence of Satya, Rajas and Tamaḥ, the three qualities of primal nature which work at the basis of all creation.[1] Once the ground is so prepared, love finds scope of luxurint growth in the heart of the Śuddhasattva man. "Pure love is not a thing of this world; it experiences highest development in the minds of those who are Svatasiddha or saintly by nature. Such men beggar description of any kind, for they are free from the influence of birth and death. Arguments can be adduced to prove the nature of common love, but not that of the Svatasiddha men. If it be said that it is a thing of this world, then it is transient, but it cannot be so, for it is an attribute of God who suffers no change."[2]

[1] তিনগুণ থর্ব্ব হৈলে শুদ্ধ সত্ত্ব হয়।
তৎপরে বিশুদ্ধ সত্ত্বে প্রেমের আশ্রয়॥
Ratavilāsa-P., p. 17.

And সত্ত্ব রজঃ তমঃ পরে শুদ্ধসত্ত্ব নাম।
তৎপরে বিশুদ্ধসত্ত্বে প্রেমের আখ্যান॥ *Ibid*, p. 35.

[2] সৃষ্টিমধ্যে বহিস্কৃত শুদ্ধসত্ত্ব প্রেমা।
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ স্বভাবে এই প্রেম সীমা॥
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ স্বভাব বর্ণনান্তরে স্থিতি।
তা সভার কভু নহে প্রলয় উৎপত্তি॥
স্বাভাবিক প্রীতি প্রমান বহুতর।
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ মনুষ্যগণ প্রমাণের পর॥
প্রাকৃত বলি তারে, কহি যে নশ্বর।
নশ্বর নহে কদাচ নহেত ঈশ্বর॥ *Ibid*, p. 35.

Another characteristic of the Svatasiddha man is that he is the master of himself. The Rativilāsapaddhati says—" Under a mystic influence men roam hither and thither (being guided by the impulses of desire), but those who are Svatasiddha rule over their own domain of self. They are well-established in what may be called their own land, and do not move a step astray even under the influence of blind Fate. When they move, it is because they wish to do so, but they never serve another's will, nor even of Fate's. Being thus born truly as men, they are called Svatasiddha." [1]

In the Padas of Caṇḍīdāsa there is a song which deals with the characteristics of those who may really be entitled to the appellation of men. It runs as follows :—

মানুষ মানুষ সবাই কহয়ে
মানুষ কেমন জন।
মানুষ রতন মানুষ জীবন
মানুষ পরাণ ধন ॥
ভরমে ভুলয়ে অনেক জন
মরম নাহিক জানে।
মানুষের প্রেম নাহি জীবলোকে
মানুষে সে প্রেম জানে ॥

[1] ঈশ্বর বশে জীব ভ্রমে সর্ব্বদেশে।
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ মনুষ্য তারা নিজ দেশে বৈসে ॥
স্বদেশে স্থিতি, পদ এক অন্যত্র না চলে।
স্বতঃসিদ্ধ মনুষ্য সে নিতে নারে দৈববলে ॥
নিজেচ্ছায় স্বতঃসিদ্ধ অন্য দেশে যায়।
কৌতুকার্থে-গমন, দৈববল নাহি তায় ॥
যথার্থ মানুষ দেহ আশ্রয় করিল।
এই উক্তে স্বতঃসিদ্ধ ভাব পাইল ॥ p. 21.

মানুষ যারা জীয়ন্তে মরা
সেই সে মানুষ সার।
মানুষ-লক্ষণ মহাভাবগণ
মানুষ ভাবের পার॥
মানুষ নাম বিরল ধাম
বিরল তাহার রীতি।
চণ্ডীদাস কহে সকলি বিরল
কে জানে তাহার রীতি॥

[Song No. 819 of the Pariṣad Ed., compared with other versions.]

"We all speak of man, but what are the real characteristics of man is not known to all.

Man is the gem, the very life of creation, and he is formed of the very best things that can captivate our imagination. Many of us are deceived by looking into the visible exterior, but do not peep into the secret wherein lies the real foundation of manhood.

The truth is that love makes the man,—love which is not of this world, but of a kind which is superb. A man worth the name must know this sort of love.

The ideal man lives like the dead though alive.

The chief characteristic of man is that he should possess all noble emotions—the very best that we can conceive.

Such men are, indeed, rare, and extraordinary are also their manners. Caṇḍīdāsa says that all rare things are grouped in man, and mysterious are his ways."

The idea that man should live like the dead though alive, leads us to another characteristic of the Suddha-sattva man upon which the Sahajiyās lay great stress. It is repeatedly asserted by them that in the sphere of mystic culture a man should adopt the nature of a

woman. This means that the man of the nature of a woman should have his passions under perfect control, and give up the qualities of sex altogether. This is no doubt living more dead than alive, but it is said that this is the real human nature, the attainment of which brings in Mokṣa or emancipation.[1]

Summary.

We have thus gone through some of the chief characteristics of the Śuddhasattva, otherwise called Svatasiddha or Sahaja men. They should be godly in character, full of devotion, unattached to worldly things, master of their passions, unenvious, humblest of the humble, peaceful at heart, unconcerned at harm done to them, of undisturbed temperament, full of love and all other noble emotions, more dead than alive, and of the nature of a woman. These are qualities which a man should possess.

Paramātmā in Sahajiyā ideal.

Thus far we have dealt with the qualities of the Svatasiddha man, but as we have seen that the individual soul comes from the Paramātmā, the true nature of man cannot be rightly understood without an enquiry into the nature of that Supreme Being. Our stereotyped conception about Paramātmā is that all the worlds emanated

[1] শুদ্ধসত্য মানুস যেই স্বভাব বিনস্বতি।
স্ত্রীমূর্ত্তি আশ্রিত তার ভজন পীরিতি ॥
স্ত্রীমূর্ত্তি বলিব কারে, কেমন লক্ষণ।
তাহার বিশেষ কথা শুনহ এখন ॥
আপনি স্ত্রী অঙ্গ হব আনুকুল্য করি।
আপনার নারী দিয়া আপনি সেবারি ॥
তাহাতে পুরুষত্ব কিবা জাতি কুল দিয়া।
নাম মাত্র পুরুষ তার আকার পাইয়া ॥

from him, and that he rules over all individual forms,[1] but the Sahajiyās have their own way of explaining the nature of this Great Being. They say that he is the fountain of constant joy who knows no grief, and that in these characteristics he is identical with the ideal Sahaja man.[2] It is further stated that he is the purest of the pure, and that he is born as a Suddhasattva man when he experiences the desire of enjoying the pleasures of love. Though both Kāma and Prema originate in him, yet the former is adverse to his nature, while the latter is quite natural to him. The male and the female elements remain in a state of perpetual union in him, and he enjoys the pleasure of such union without any interruption, in which characteristic he represents the ideal

নপুংসক নহে সেই .... আছে তার।
স্ত্রীলিঙ্গ না হয়, আছে পুরুষ আকার॥
অতএব বিশেষ পাইল সেই নরে।
বিধ অর্থে মনুষ্যত্ব, মোক্ষ বলি তারে॥
Ratnasāra, p. 5.

চৌদ্দ ভুবনের জন্ম পরমাত্মা হৈতে হয়।
দেহ মধ্যে অধিকারী পরমাত্মা মহাশয়॥
পরমাত্মা পরম পুরুষ অধিকারী।
দেহ মধ্যে যত কিছু অনুগত তারি॥
Nigūḍhārtha-P., p. 3.

সুখময় পরমাত্মা সুখের নিধান।
সুখ বিনু দুঃখ আদি কিছু নহে আন॥
দুঃখ রহিত তিহো সদানন্দময়।
সহজ বস্তু পরমাত্মা জানিহ নিশ্চয়॥ *Ibid*, p. 2.

Sahaja man. As he is ever joyful, so he is said to live in a land of perpetual joy.[1]

It is thus quite evident that both love and joy are considered natural attributes of God. But just as joy is perpetual in him, so his love is also of universal character. It pervades the whole world, and does not forsake even the smallest insect of creation. The Rasaratnasāra observes—

God's love is universal.

"God sports with love in the whole universe, even the Primeval Nature is going mad after this love. The movements of the planets and the stars proclaim this love, and the oceans and the waves bear testimony to it. The play of Divine love is visible everywhere, and in every household. It can be felt as much in enjoyment, as in austerities and ailments. The fact that God is love, is proclaimed by every object of creation."[2]

1 বিশিষ্ট রূপেতে শুদ্ধ বিশুদ্ধ আখ্যানে।
শুদ্ধসত্ত্ব হন তিঁহো প্রেম আস্বাদনে॥
বিরুদ্ধ ধর্ম্ম তার কাম আচরণ।
কামপ্রেম দুই ধর্ম্ম তাহার কারণ॥
সহজ বস্তু পরমাত্মা প্রকৃতি পুরুষ জোড়া।
তিলার্দ্ধেক মাত্র তার সুখ নাহি ছাড়া॥
সদা আনন্দময় পরমাত্মা হয়।
সদানন্দ নাম গ্রাম তাহাতেই কয়॥ *Ibid*, p. 2.

2 অখিল ভরিয়া যাঁর নিত্য প্রেম রাস।
পরমা প্রকৃতি যেই প্রেমেতে উদাস॥
যাঁর প্রেমে মত্ত হয়ে ভ্রমে গ্রহ তারা।
সাগরে তরঙ্গে ছুটে যে প্রেমের ধারা॥
অন্তরে বাহিরে প্রেম, প্রেম ঘরে ঘরে।
ভোগে প্রেম, যোগে প্রেম, রোগে প্রেম ঝরে॥

Having thus spoken about love and joy, we come to the topic of the beauty of God, for we know that love, beauty and bliss go together. The appreciation of the beauty of God primarily depends upon the conception that He is present in every object, and in every phenomenon of nature. The all-pervading character of God has been described in various ways by the poets and philosophers of all ages and climes, and this idea is a common characteristic of all the religious systems of the world. Though we are thus quite familiar with the subject, yet we cannot rest satisfied without enquiring how the Sahajiyās have dealt with this matter, for we are here dealing with the Sahajiyā doctrine. The Ratnasāra says—

God's beauty is all-pervading.

রসরাজ কহেন আমি সর্ব্বজন প্রাণ।
রস আমি প্রাণ আমি না জান সন্ধান॥
আমারে ভজন কর নিজ অঙ্গ দিয়া।
কামরূপে প্রেম আমি, কায়ারূপে ছায়া॥
মায়ারূপী হই আমি জগত কারণ।
আমি পালি, আমি মারি, করিয়ে রক্ষণ॥
আমি জল, আমি স্থল, সর্ব্ব জীবের প্রাণ।
আমার মহিমা কেহ না জানে সন্ধান॥
পৃথিবী আমার দেহ, আমিত আকাশ।
স্থাবর জঙ্গম সব, আমার প্রকাশ॥

হেন প্রেম উৎস খুলি যে দিল ছুটায়ে।
সাধ্য কার তত্ত্ব তাঁর দিবেক ফুটায়ে॥
সর্ব্বসাক্ষীভূত হরি নিত্য প্রেমময়।
p. 1.

ক্ষুধা, তৃষ্ণা হই আমি শরিরে আশ্রিত।
বাই পিত্ত রস আমি, আমি হিতাহিত ॥

p. 89.

We have also a narration of this kind in the Svarupakalpataru (U. MS. No. 2520)—

আমি সর্ব্বজন প্রাণ, আমি সর্ব্ব মায়া।
আমারে ভজন কর নিজ অঙ্গ দিয়া ॥
আমি জল, আমি স্থল, অগ্নি আকাশ।
স্থাবর জঙ্গম সব আমার প্রকাশ ॥
আমি ক্ষুধা, আমি তৃষ্ণা, বাউ পিত্ত, রস।
আপনা আপনি আমি আপনার বশ ॥
আমি আপ, আমি তাপ, শোক, লোহ, মোহ।
আমি আসি, আমি যাই, না জানয়ে কেহ ॥
সর্প হয়া দংশি আমি, ওঝা হয়া ঝারি।
জলের কুম্ভীর হয়া আমি আমায় ধরি ॥ etc.

p. 2.

We thus find that God is the life of all. He is both Kāma and Prema, both the body and its shadow. He manifests Himself as Māyā for the sake of creation; He creates, preserves and destroys. He is earth, water, and sky, presenting Himself in the movable and the immovable objects. He is hunger and thirst in the body, as well as heat and cold, grief, greed and illusion. What is born, therein he is, and what dies, he is there also. He is in the snake that bites, and in the physician who cures. This is the mysterious nature of God, wherein is manifested the marvellous beauty of that Supreme Being.

These are some of the chief characteristics of Paramātmā. He is ever full of love, full of joy, and His beauty pervades the whole universe. The Sahajiyās

lay special stress on these three characteristics, because they have their doctrine based on the culture of love, beauty and bliss. Now, the Upaniṣads maintain that the realisation of Brahma brings in liberation and immortality (Tait. Up., 2-1-1; Ch. Up., 7-26-2; Śvet. Up., 3-8; Muṇḍ. Up., 3-2-6, etc.). The Sahajiyās also say that the knowledge of Paramātmā is the *summum bonum* of human life—

পরমাত্মা জ্ঞান পূর্ণ প্রীতির আধার।
সেই প্রীতি জীবের পরিণাম সার॥

Rasaratnasāra, p. 50.

It is also maintained that only the grace of the Supreme Being can reveal the mysteries of supreme knowledge to one who can realise Him in the mind. The experience of spiritual joy indicates the dawn of consciousness on one hand, and the passing away of the darkness of ignorance on the other.[1] In the Amṛtarasāvalī we have—

সহজ কথাটি সহজে বলে।
তবে কেন সে সহজে না চলে॥
জগত সংসার যাহাতে রয়।
যাহার বিহনে সকলি ক্ষয়॥
জানিতে যদি তাহারে পারে।
বিষ খাইলে সেহ না মরে॥

p. 6.

1 এই সব তত্ত্ব দেখাবার কর্ত্তা সবে এক জন হয়।
তাহার উদয় যাহার হৃদয় সেই সে দেখিতে পায়॥
আনন্দ উদয়ে চৈতন্য মিলয়ে সব ধন্দ যায় দূরে।
তাহার উদয় যাবত না হয় তাবত তিমির ঘোরে॥
Nigūḍhār.-P., p. 14.

"Men often speak of Sahaja in a light mood, but how is it that they do not see what is there in this mode of culture! The highest ideal of the doctrine is the realisation of Paramātmā, in whom rests the whole world, and whose absence means death to all. He who knows Him attains immortality."

So we find that much importance is attached to the knowledge of Paramātmā, the realisation of whom is held out here as the aim of the Sahajiyā doctrine. But how can such realisation advance one in the matter of spirituality? We know that the individual soul is a spark of the Supreme Soul, from which it follows that the former should be of the nature of the latter, for the sweetness of sugar is even present in an atom separated from the lump. So, the knowledge that Paramātmā is naturally full of love, full of joy, and full of beauty, brings in the idea that our individual soul also possesses these characteristics, and this is the first step towards spiritual advancement. It is only for this reason that so much importance is attached to the knowledge of Paramātmā. It is well-known that the Sahajiyās are Parakīyās. In this aspect of the religion, the doctrine is identified with the knowledge of *Para* or Paramātmā, as stated in—

পরমাত্মা বিনে পর অন্য পর নয়।

Necessity of culture.

But some sort of culture is necessary for the realisation of the spiritual truth of this kind. Men are of different temperaments, and of varied tastes and capacities, The beauty that captivates the heart of one, may appear uninteresting to another; besides, all of us do not possess the same capacity of appreciation. If the matter comes to such a pass when some sort of limited beauty is to be appreciated with the help of our physical organs

there will be no end of disagreement and confusion, when universal beauty of the kind narrated below has to be enjoyed with the help of our mental faculties—

ব্রজপুর রূপনগরে
রসের নদী বয়।
তীর বহিয়া ঢেউ আসিয়া
লাগিল গোরা-গায়॥
গৌর-অঙ্গে প্রেম-তরঙ্গে
উঠে দিবারাতি।
জ্ঞান-কর্ম্ম যোগ-কর্ম্ম
তপ ছাড়িল যতি॥

মনে মনে কত জনে
দিচ্ছে রূপের দায়।
সে যে রূপ সুধাকূপ
ঠোর নাহিক পায়॥
রূপ ভাবনা গলায় সোনা
ঘুচলে মনের ধান্ধা।
রূপের ধারা বাউল পারা
বহিছে জগত আন্ধা॥
রূপ রসে জগত ভাসে
এ চৌদ্দ ভুবনে।
হইলে মজে দেখিলে যজে
কহিলে কেবা জানে॥
ঠারে ঠোরে কহিনু ঘোরে
বুঝিতে পারে যেবা।
পরম দুঃখী হইবে সুখী
প্রকট করিবে সেবা॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 48.

"The river of bliss is flowing in the Vraja, the city of beauty. It overflowed its bank, and a wave touched the heart of Caitanya, generating in him a tempest of love. There are many who exercise mental faculties to create a standard of beauty, but they do not even get the scent of that universal beauty which is the source of perpetual enjoyment. The current of beauty is rolling over the whole world investing it with the charm of molten gold, visible only to those who know how to appreciate it. No verbal instruction can create that instinct, but once it is created, it brings joy even to the most unhappy minds."

The wave that touched the heart of Caitanya may pass over many of us without leaving any impression in our mind. Those who like him have the spiritual instinct developed by nature, for them no culture is necessary, for they get it like the instinct of infants who from birth know how to suck the breast of the mother. But unfortunately, in many of us that vision is clouded, and it is for the men of this type that spiritual training is necessary for the growth of that power which lies latent or paralysed. The Rūpānuga-Bhajana-Darpaṇa says—

সহজ ভজন রতি নাহি চায় শিক্ষা মতি
তবু শিক্ষা প্রাথমিক রীতি ॥

পুত্রস্নেহ জননীর সহজ হৃদয়ে স্থির
দূষিত হৃদয়ে শিক্ষা চাই ।

কৃষ্ণপ্রেম সেইরূপ নিত্যসিদ্ধ অপরূপ
বদ্ধ জীবে অপ্রকট ভাই ॥

সেইত সহজ রতি পাইয়াছে অপগতি
শিক্ষানুশীলন যদি পায়।
সে রতি জাগিয়া উঠে জীবের বন্ধন ছুটে
ব্রজানন্দ তাহারে নাচায় ॥

pp. 2-3.

"Though Sahaja love does not depend upon any training, yet culture is necessary at the primary stage. Affection is quite natural to a mother, but those who are of perverted mind, require instruction for the generation of that love. Similarly, the love of God is also natural to every individual, but in those persons who are bound in the worldly ties, it is not manifested until generated by proper culture."

Culture is, therefore, necessary for training the mind of the common people, but there is an amount of mysticism in this culture to which one cannot enter without the help of a Guru. Mere reading or hearing cannot give that spiritual insight which opens the door of universal beauty and perpetual enjoyment. There is a peculiar way of looking into the manifestations of nature, holding love as an important factor on the basis of which every phenomenon should be interpreted. This is the special feature of the Sahajiyā doctrine. But there is still a higher aspect of this culture in which there is greater mysticism, to which we turn our attention at this stage.

The followers of this cult.

Hereinbefore we have dealt with several aspects of the Sahajiyā doctrine as they are found treated in the Sahajiyā literature, but something more remains to be said which is undoubtedly of a very important nature. It may also be reasonably expected of us that we should make a statement about what we have heard from the Sahajiyās themselves

speaking about their own religion. In fact, we have mixed with them with the eagerness of an inquisitive truth-seeker, and found them divided into various sects, each following a particular mode of culture narrated before. But the very best ideal, as it is called, of the Sahajiyā doctrine is advocated by a considerable section of the cultured Sahajiyās, whose character and attainments have filled us with admiration. It is about this aspect of the doctrine that we are going to discuss in this place.

The new significance of the terms Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.

Though the Sahajiyās are the followers of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, yet in this particular aspect of culture they have no conception about the personal existence of Kṛṣṇa. They use the term Kṛṣṇa simply to signify an idea, and the term Rādhā is also used by them in the same manner. In the first place, they differentiate between Kṛṣṇa of the Yadu race, and Kṛṣṇa of the Vṛndāvana. The Rativilāsa-Paddhati says—"Kṛṣṇa of the race of Yadu is quite different from that Kṛṣṇa who is known as the son of a milkman. The latter always resides in the Vṛndāvana, while the former has no ever-permanent residence, for he experiences births and deaths."[1] Even the idea of Kṛṣṇa as the God-head is not advocated by these men. Dvija Caṇḍīdāsa writes—"The God who resides in the conventional Kṣīroda-Samudra (ocean of milk) comes into and goes away from this world through repeated births and deaths just as ordinary men do; he should, therefore, be considered not

[1] গোপেন্দ্র-নন্দন কৃষ্ণ এক হয় অন্য।
যদুবংশে উদ্ভব সেই কৃষ্ণ ভিন্ন॥
বৃন্দাবনে সদাস্থিতি গোপবংশ যেই।
গমনাগমন করে যদুবংশ সেই॥ p. 20.

better than them in any way."[1] It is also asserted that those who think of Kṛṣṇa as God, follow an ideal which leads to a different goal.[2] In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta we have also teachings of this nature. It says—"Kṛṣṇa is to be attained by adopting the emotion peculiar to Vraja, where there is no conception about him as God," and that "Kṛṣṇa is the Rasa personified, and Rādhā is the personification of love, while the land of Vraja has its existence only in the sphere of emotion."[3] It will thus appear quite clear that both the Sahajiyās and the Vaiṣṇavas do not use the terms Rādhā, Kṛṣṇa and Vṛndāvana in the sense in which they are commonly used. In fact

[1] সংস্কার যেই ব্রহ্মাণ্ডেতে সেই
সামান্ত তাহার নাম।
মরণে জীবনে করে গতাগতি
ক্ষীরোদ সায়রে ধাম ॥
Padāvalī of Caṇḍīdāsa, p. 348.

[2] যদি কহ কৃষ্ণ হয় পরম ঈশ্বর।
ইহা যদি মনে কর যাবে ধামান্তর ॥
U. MS., No. 562, p. 1.

[3] ব্রজলোকের ভাবে পাই তাঁহার চরণ।
তাঁরে ঈশ্বর করি নাহি জানে ব্রজজন ॥
Canto II, Chap. 9.

রসময় মূর্ত্তি কৃষ্ণ সাক্ষাৎ শৃঙ্গার।
And মহাভাব স্বরূপা শ্রীরাধাঠাকুরাণী।
Canto I, Chap. 4.

About Vraja—
চিন্তামণি ভূমি, কল্পবৃক্ষময় বন।
চর্ম্মচক্ষে দেখে তারে প্রপঞ্চের সম ॥
প্রেমনেত্রে দেখে তার স্বরূপ প্রকাশ।
Canto I, Chap. 5.

they have special conceptions centered round the ideas of these terms, upon which is laid the foundation of a sort of spiritual culture which is wholly of mystic nature.[1]

At this stage let us step into the domain of physical Science for a short while. It is stated that "matter is the stuff or the material of which bodies are composed, the molecules of which are held together by means of a force called the *Intermolecular Force.*" This force is at the root of the figuration of bodies. It follows, therefore, that no formation or creation would have been possible, had there been no such force to hold together the particles of matters. It is also assumed that "the molecules of a body are not at rest but always in a state of rapid motion, due to which there is a tendency of the body to expand." This is called the molecular Energy of the body. The idea of matter is thus associated with the idea of its inherent energy, and of the force of attraction holding together the adjacent parts, which manifests itself in the form of the force of Gravitation. These are some of the fundamental properties of matter, the idea of which will help us to enter into the secret of the mystic faith we are going to describe here.

Matter and Energy.

1 কৃষ্ণতত্ত্ব রাধাতত্ত্ব প্রেমতত্ত্ব সার।
রসতত্ত্ব লীলাতত্ত্ব বিবিধ প্রকার॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 20.

And কৃষ্ণের স্বরূপ কহ—রাধিকা-স্বরূপ।
রস কোন্ তত্ত্ব, প্রেম কোন্ তত্ত্বরূপ॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto II, Chap. 8.

It should be borne in mind that this material element of nature is designated by the term Kṛṣṇa, and its inherent Energy by Rādhā. As the energy is contained in the matter, so Kṛṣṇa is said to be the Ādhāra or Āśraya (receptacle) which holds the energy Rādhā.[1] The relation between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā is thus the relation of a vessel with its content or Viṣaya. They are so correlated that one cannot be conceived without the other, and in the union of the two lies the mystery of creation.[2] This doctrine of Ādhāra is to be the basis of spiritual knowledge.[3]

Kṛṣṇa is Matter, and Rādhā the Energy.

The Matter and its Energy are also considered to be the dual manifestations of the same cause, the former being designated technically by the terms Kāma or Kandarpa, while the latter by Madana.[4] They are also respectively called Puruṣa and Prakṛti, the one being represented

Their relationship.

[1] অনন্ত ব্রহ্মাণ্ড ইহা সভার আধার।
Cait.-Carit., Canto II, Chap. 8.
And
কৃষ্ণ—নিজ শক্তি, রাধা—ক্রীড়ার সহায়।
Ibid, Canto I, Chap. 4.

[2] আশ্রয় বিষয় দুই কৈল পরচার।
দুই মিলি হয় পূর্ণ মাধুর্য্য সাধন॥
Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 15.
And
প্রতি বিষয়ানন্দে তদাশ্রয়ানন্দ।
Ibid, p. 15.

[3] আধার ধরহ মন আর কিছু নাই।
আধার ধরিয়া নিত্যধামে চলি যাই।
Ibid, p. 79.

[4] এক বস্তু দুই কাম মদন যার নাম।
U. MS. No. 615, p. 2.

by Kṛṣṇa, and the other by Rādhā.[1] This Puruṣa and the Prakṛti are so closely united by bond of love that the separation of one means the death of the other.[2] This is also a scientific truth that without energy matter becomes lifeless, while without matter no energy can find a stay. This intimate union of Puruṣa and Prakṛti (of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā) is figuratively expressed with the help of the simile of unreserved union of man and woman,[3] and this is the basis of spiritual culture established on the Śṛṅgāra ideal.

Philosophical speculations about the relationship of Puruṣa and Prakṛti are found in the literature of other schools also. They have been specially the subject of discussion in the Sāṁkhya system, in some of the Pañcarātra Saṁhitās, in the Bhāgavata, the Gītā, the Purāṇas, and in the works of the later Vaiṣṇavas like Rāmānuja, Ānandatīrtha, Nimbārka, Rāmānanda, and

[1] কৃষ্ণতত্ত্ব কন্দর্প রাধাতত্ত্ব মদন ।

Ibid, p. 3.

And

কাম আর মদন দুই প্রকৃতি পুরুষ ।

Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī (P. E.), p. 334.

[2] এমতি জানিহ ভাই প্রকৃতি পুরুষ ।
পীরিতি প্রেমের লাগি দোহে দোহার বশ ॥
দোহার বিচ্ছেদ দোহে সহিতে না পারে ।
তিলেক বিচ্ছেদ হইলে পরাণে সে মরে ॥

U. MS. No. 2533, p. 3.

[3] উজ্জ্বল মধুর রস শৃঙ্গার সম্ভোগ ।
প্রেম-পরিপূর্ণ দোহার রসের সংযোগ ॥

Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 3.

Vallabha.[1] The relation between Prakṛti and Puruṣa in the Sāṁkhya system is like that of a woman seated on the shoulder of a man making him subservient to her will, but in the Vaiṣṇava religion of Bengal she is united with Puruṣa in the close embrace of love. The teachers of the other systems have indulged in abstract philosophical speculations in going to find out the nature of this intimate relationship, but those of the Caitanya school have adopted the ideal of love as it exists between a lover and his beloved. Rādhā is to them not only the manifestation of the faculty of Joy embodied in Kṛṣṇa,[2] but she represents his full potentiality, and in union is attached to him like musk and its scent, or fire and its heat.[3] The idea of such inseparable union in the romantic sphere of love is the keystone of the modern Vaiṣṇavism of Bengal which has also been adopted by the Sahajiyās in developing their mystic cult.

Explanation.

Let us now see what is meant by the statement that Kāma and Madana is represented by Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. Kāma (popularly known as Cupid) is believed to be armed with arrows

[1] *Vide* R. G. Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism, pp. 1-80.

[2] শ্রীরাধাহি কৃষ্ণস্য স্বরূপভূতাহ্লাদিনীশক্তিরেব।
Ujjvalanīlamaṇī.

রাধাকৃষ্ণপ্রণয়বিকৃতিহ্লাদিনী শক্তিঃ।
Kaḍacā of Svarūpa.

[3] রাধা পূর্ণ শক্তি, কৃষ্ণ পূর্ণ শক্তিমান্।
দুই বস্তু ভেদ নাহি শাস্ত্র পরমাণ॥
মৃগমদ, তার গন্ধ—যৈছে অবিচ্ছেদ।
অগ্নি জ্বালাতে যৈছে নাহি কভু ভেদ॥
রাধাকৃষ্ণ ঐছে সদা একই স্বরূপ।
Cait.-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

with the help of which he sports in the whole world. These arrows are not of steel, but of tender materials which can touch the feelings, and raise the waves of love at every stroke. They work, therefore, wholly in the sphere of emotion, for they are meant for the generation of love. Now, the sight of the moon, the scent of the flower, the hearing of melodious sound, the touch of soft breezes, and the taste of charming sweets, can each gladden an organ of sense and create attachment, but think of the object which can at once captivate all the senses! Surely the love thus produced will be perfect in every respect. In Indian mythology, therefore, the arrows of Cupid are said to be of five kinds. By designating Kṛṣṇa as Kāma it is meant that He possesses all the attributes which can captivate the senses and attract the minds of all.[1] Rādhā, on the other hand, symbolises Madana, for she always longs for union with Kṛṣṇa. Like energy she cannot stand alone, but must have repose in the bosom of that eternal Matter which is her main stay. This longing or attraction manifested in a symbolical way is usually called Love.

The conception lies wholly in immaterial sphere.

That this conception of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa lies purely in the immaterial sphere, has also been witnessed by the author of the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta thus[2]—"The young Madana of the Vṛndāvana has no physical existence. He is to be

[1] যেই হেতু সর্ব্বচিত্ত আকরষণ করে।
স্থাবর জঙ্গম আদি সর্ব্ব চিত্ত হরে॥
সকলের মন সেই কামে হরি লয়।
অতএব কামরূপে কৃষ্ণ নিশ্চয়॥
Ratnasāra, p. 88.

[2] বৃন্দাবনে অপ্রাকৃত নবীন মদন।
কামগায়ত্রী কামবীজে যাঁর উপাসন॥

worshipped with the mystic formula of Kāma. He is so powerful that he can attract the heart of the whole world." This power of attraction is figuratively termed as arrows, and in its highest aspect the Sahajiyā culture is based upon this ideal of mystic attraction. Caṇḍīdāsa says that the Sahajiyā culture is to be observed with the help of emotional arrows.[1] The Vivarta-Vilāsa maintains that the mystic culture should be based upon the principle of arrows.[2] This means that all the senses should be engaged in realising the mysteries of love, symbolically spoken of as offering services to Kṛṣṇa.[3] "The ears should long for the melodious sound of his flute, the nose for the smell of his body, the eyes for the beauty of his person, the tongue for the nectar of his lips, and above all, a desire for union with him."[4]

পুরুষ যোষিৎ কিবা স্থাবর জঙ্গম।
সর্ব্বচিত্তাকর্ষক সাক্ষাৎ মন্মথ-মদন॥

Canto II, Chap. 8.

[1] বাণের সহিতে সদাই যজিতে
সহজের এই রীতি।

Caṇḍīdāsa's Padāvalī (P. E.), Song No. 764.

N. B.—Not বুঝিতে but যজিতে as quoted in the Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 40.

[2] সাধন বিবর্ত্ত পঞ্চ বাণেতে কহিব। p. 10.

[3] আনুকূল্য সর্ব্বেন্দ্রিয়ে কৃষ্ণানুশীলন। *Ibid*, p. 63.

[4] শুনিতে নাগরী নাগরবাণী।
শ্রবণ পাতিয়া বংশীধ্বনি॥
অঙ্গ গন্ধ তার নাসাতে বসে।
ভুলিল নাসা তাহার আশে॥
নয়নের শোভা দরশন আশে।
রূপ দেখি নয়ন তাহাতে পৈশে॥

When love is generated of such intensity, it cannot be checked by any means, as is expressed in a song of Caṇḍīdāsa noted below.[1] The lesson it imparts is that all the senses should be employed for spiritual realisation.[2]

It is purely symbolical.

In the quotations noted above there are references to the physical features of Kṛṣṇa, who has thus been made practically finite in conception for bringing him within the sphere of human love. How can then this love influence the mind when the imagination works in the immaterial sphere? It is said that the material should be converted into the immaterial,[3] or in other words, the progress is from the

রসনা লালসা বাড়িল চিতে।
কিরূপে পাইব অধরামৃতে।
অনুরাগ দেখিয়া অনুকূল বিধি।
যদি হয় তবে পাবে সে নিধি॥ etc.

Sudhāmṛta-Kaṇikā, p. 10.

1 যত নিবরিয়ে চিতে নিবার না যায় রে।
আন পথে চলিতে চায় আন পথে ধায়রে॥
এ ছার রসনা মোর হইল কি বাম রে।
যার নাম না লইব তার নাম লয় রে॥
এ ছার নাসিকা মুই কত করু বন্ধ।
তবু ত দারুণ নাসা পায় তার গন্ধ॥ etc.

Song No. 369.

2 সহজ ভজন কর্ত্তা দশেন্দ্রিয়গণ।

Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, p. 20.

3 প্রাকৃতকে করিবে তুমি সে অপ্রাকৃত।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 37.

Also

অপ্রাকৃত কর্ম্ম করে প্রাকৃত আচারে।

Vṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā, p. 24.

concrete to the abstract ideas.[1] Not only should such transformation be effected in the conception of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, but Vṛndāvana, the place of their amorous sports, must also have a similar application. So it is said that this Vṛndāvana has a mysterious existence in the pleasant feelings of the mind.[2] We shall now see what sort of spiritual culture is based upon the conception of this kind.

How is Nature studied for spiritual knowledge.

To begin with, let us peep into the secret concerning the formation of objects. It should be remembered in this connection that the whole universe is created from the union of Matter and Energy (Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā), or in other words, every object of nature has Puruṣa and Prakṛti united in the inseparable bond of love.[3] This idea at once brings in the conception that there is unity between self and the rest of the world, and that there is essentially no difference between one object and another.[4] This is the very foundation of the feeling of universal love.

1 রূপ হৈতে স্বরূপ হয় জানিবে নিশ্চয়।

Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, p. 9.

2 সেই ব্রজ অনিমিত্ত চিদানন্দ ময়।

Rasakadambakalikā, p. 20.

3 সকল শরীরে হয় অর্দ্ধাঙ্গ অবলা।

And পুরুষ প্রকৃতি দুই দেহ মধ্যে আছে ॥

Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 4.

Also প্রেম পরিপূর্ণ দোহার রসের সংযোগ।

Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 3.

4 বস্তুতত্ব নরোত্তম কোথা কিছু নাই।
কেবল আছয় এক অনন্ত আত্মাই ॥

Rasaratnasāra, p. 39.

Secondly. The mysteries of creation should be viewed from another most important standpoint. It should be observed or rather perfectly realised that love, as we have said before, is the cement in the union of Matter and Energy, and that it is constantly at play with all objects of nature [1] according to some universal law which is maintaining the order of creation.[2] The idea of this never-ending play of Energy with love is to be nurtured by putting in the background the conception of the attributes of the Eternal Matter called mystic Kāma, and the mysteries of creation is to be solved on this ideal.[3] Culture based on a conception like this is

[1] লীলাকুমুদ যথা তথায় বৈসে প্রেম।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 72.

কাম যার মহাকাম জগতে বিহরে ॥
মহাকাম পরমারাধ্য নন্দের নন্দন।
প্রাকৃত সে কামরূপে ব্যাপে জগজ্জন ॥ *Ibid*, p. 47.

And রায় কহে—কৃষ্ণ হয় ধীর ললিত।
নিরন্তর কাম ক্রীড়া যাহার চরিত ॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto II, Chap. 8.

[2] সত্যরূপে জগমধ্যে করয়ে বিহার।
And অদ্যাবধি সেই লীলা এইরূপে হয়।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, pp. 13 and 15.

[3] বৃন্দাবনে অপ্রাকৃত নবীন মদন।
কামগায়ত্রী কামবীজে যার উপাসন ॥
অপ্রাকৃত নবীন মদন বলি যারে।
সৃষ্টিরূপা কামরূপা লীলা কহি তারে ॥

Rasatattvasāra, p. 5.

the best form of culture,[1] which is to be secretly practised in the mind.[2]

The domain of Love.

Thirdly. Love is technically termed attraction, and it manifests itself as much in the force of gravitation as in the hankering of one soul for union with another soul. Science has proved that the attraction between two kinds of electricity is of the same nature as that existing between two poles of magnets. So, the apparent differences lie only in the form of manifestation, but there is essentially no real difference of any kind. Love is practically the gravitation of the soul, and when it embraces like earth all the objects of nature, its mission is fulfilled with the attainment of its highest aim.

The theory of evolution.

The object of this love is to bring in a state of perfection in every object. The male and the female elements of creation taken separately are simply halves of an ideal whole, and it is only through love that they become perfect again in union. It is the law of nature that for the preservation of species procreation should only begin from the perfect stage. As youth is the best time of production, so is the sentiment of love uppermost in the minds of the youth. Every new-born baby testifies to the victory of love, and it is so all-pervading that even the smallest insect is within the sphere of its influence. Flower is popularly believed to be an inanimate object, but in this aspect of culture

[1] প্রেমতত্ত্ব পরম সাধন।

Vṛhat-Premabhakti-Candrikā, p. 15.

[2] গোপনে সাধিবে সদা হৃদয়ের মাঝে।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 49.

it is the blossom of love. Nature has given it beauty and honey to make it attractive. Bees are drawn towards it, and then begins fertilisation which results in the production of seeds. As soon as this is done, the petals begin to fall off, but that does not mean the death of the flower. It is rather the effect of the attainment of perfection, the fulfilment of the object for which the flower was created.

There is nothing dead.

In the economy of nature there is no place for useless things; when the highest aim is attained there is simply a passing from one state to another, but no death. The idea of death is, therefore, entirely absent from the Sahajiyā conception of this nature. The seed exhausts itself in the production of the tree, which bears flowers for the production of the seed from which again new plants grow up. This is simply passing from one state to another through a cycle of existences, but there is no death worth the name. It necessarily follows that the man who has a conception like this, must consider himself free from the influence of death.

"Death!" exclaimed a Sahajiyā Guru, "What do you mean by it? Look at the thing from this standpoint. Logically, what is gold, every part of it is gold, and what is not-gold, every part of it is not-gold. Now, take up what is called the inanimate earth. It has really the greatest life-giving property of all. The refuse matters are used as the best manure, and the dead bones are utilised for producing luxuriant growth. If all these objects are really lifeless, where do they find the life-giving properties? Nature being always full of energies cannot countenance inactivity. Whenever she finds anything inactive, she at once turns it to something useful, and in the new growth we always find a new lease of life.

In fact, there is nothing dead in nature, and nothing dies. So are we, the human beings. We were not produced from nothing, and we cannot melt into nothingness. We have a sure antecedent, as well as a hopeful future. We are born with the inheritance of perpetual life." The Guru spoke from firm conviction, and we were led to believe that he was really inspired. That this idealistic mysticism is a most important characteristic of the highest aspect of the Sahajiyā doctrine has also been witnessed in the Amṛtarasāvalī, thus—

Nayanakāmā (spiritual insight personified) says—
" Hear what I say about the Sahajiyā doctrine.

The mystic land is not situated at a particular locality, but it extends far and wide covering the whole universe. Men who are of that sphere are mysterious, for they experience no decay or death.

The temple of idealism built on it, and the very essence of its conception, are not usually known to all, and it cannot also be easily realised how everything of that place remains always invested with the freshness of youth.

The man who can know this, at once finds himself in the atmosphere of that region.

The fact is that one should have a clear insight into the tendency of Nature and the qualities of Matter (Puruṣa). He who knows this is a man worthy of the name.

The root cause of creation is to be sought on the basis of the idealistic realisation of such a place which remains Ever-permanent." [1]

[1] নয়নকামা কহে শুন আমার বচন।
সহজ কথা কহি আমি, ইথে দেহ মন॥

The magnification of the image of God.

Soul, in this aspect of culture, is not the object of realisation. It is only Life and its mysteries that have come to the forefront. The Sahajiyās are also not very particular about God, because in the higher sphere of mysticism the image of the beloved fades away before the floodlight of emotional realisation. Sacrifice is the barometer of love. Kāma is entirely selfish, but as soon as the lover begins to find joy in the sacrifice he makes for the beloved, there

গুপ্তচন্দ্রপুর সেহ অনেক দূর
চৌদ্দ ভুবনের কাছে।
নাহিক জরা কেহ নহে মরা
কি জাতি মানুষ আছে॥
কি জাতি মন্দির নহে সে গোচর
রস কোন্ হয় তার।
তাহার ভিতর কিশোরী কিশোর
না হয় গোচর কার॥
সেই রস কোন বৈসে রসিক জন
নিজের আলয় হয়।
যাহার গুণে আপনা চিনে
সেই জন তথাই রয়॥
প্রকৃতি আচার পুরুষ বেভার
যে জন জানিতে পারে।
তাহার দক্ষিণ অঙ্গে উৎপত্তি রঙ্গে
মানুষ বলিয়ে তারে॥

* * * *

দিব্য সেই স্থল সংসারের মূল
তত ক্রোশ হয় স্থান।
সেই স্থান অক্ষয় যুগে যুগে রয়
প্রলয়ে নাহিক জান॥

pp. 21-22.

is the dawn of love, and the true lover is always ready to die for his object of love. So, the relation between the lover and the beloved is of this nature that the magnification of the latter calls forth proportionate diminution of the individuality of the former. Now, joy is the graduated index in the affairs of love. It attains its maximum height of the first stage when the lover loses his individuality, and identifies himself with his beloved. At this stage, the consideration of self is conspicuous by its absence, and the object of love is doubly magnified from which then emanates a flood of joy which is the very nectar of love. But this is not the final stage of perfection, for it admits of further magnification. Look at a small light. It has a definite form. We can easily trace the zigzag course of the glowing wire of an electric bulb, but when it is fully lighted, its form vanishes within the flood of light it emits. So, when the object of love is magnified to the infinite limit, there remains nothing but brightness and joy eliminating the conception of self altogether. This is the attainment of the Infinite. Who has been variously described by saints and philosophers by using the terms IT (Tat), Formless (Nirākāraṃ), Nothing (Suṇyaṃ), Effulgence (Jyotiḥ), and Joy (Ānandaṃ), etc., for the identification of the ONE or Ekaṃ. Nevertheless, the Sahajiyās cannot be classified with the unbelievers. They have rather magnified the image of God to melt Him with every atom of creation.[1] The image of Kṛṣṇa is to them nothing but a symbolical representation. Because Matter is indestructible, so

[1] নিত্য প্রকট কৃষ্ণ আছে সর্ব্বকাল।
মাধুর্য্য নগরে রহে অতি সে রসাল॥
U. MS. No. 564, p. 12.

Kṛṣṇa who represents the Eternal Matter is painted ever-green. He wears the endless garlands of flowers signifying that He is the central figure round which is going on the process of evolution. His flute opens the spiritual insight, and the river Yamunā on the bank of which He plays, represents the passing current of natural phenomena. He is constantly engaged in the Rāsa festival, not with the Gopīs alone, but with the various objects of nature.[1] This, in short, is the view taken by the Sahajiyās about Kṛṣṇa.

Conclusion.

Herein we have simply made an attempt to give some ideas about the highest aspect of the Sahajiyā doctrine. But as it is wholly mystic in nature, there is no power in the pen to describe it. It can only be realised by those who have got the peculiar spiritual insight through proper training. In fact, this aspect of culture is fully based upon mystic realisation.[2] The appreciation of the beauty of this never-ending play of Matter and Energy with love as a constant source of creation, is the object of the

[1] সকল গোপীতে রমে সবাকার প্রাণ।
সেই সব লীলা করে বাসুদেব নাম॥
অতএব রাসস্থলী হয় দ্বিধাকার।

Rasakadambakalikā, p. 4.

And মদন গোপাল কৃষ্ণ নন্দের কুমার।
সদারত মহারাসে রাধা সমিভার॥

Rāgamayikaṇā, p. 9.

[2] সহজ ভক্তির অধিকারীর কথা সংক্ষেপে কহিব।
প্রমাণ নাহিক মাত্র কেবল অনুভব॥

Sahaja-Tattva, p. 5.

highest aspect of the Sahajiyā culture, for the Sahajiyās affirm that there is nothing that is higher than this.[1]

As regards the nature of this culture we may say that it is "man's effectively building up a Kingdom of Heaven out of the materials that are available all about him, if he but gives attention to searching them out, mastering them and putting them to the highest use."[2] The benefit of this culture is the "enrichment of character, of personality, the creation of Beauty, and the discovery of truth." It also gives us a knowledge about the nature of our true self. "Our life is certainly ours, my life is mine, your life yours. But all our lives are also elements in the life of the Absolute. The expansion of a self means incorporating other selves into his own self." As this is done by love and sympathy, so Love is the watch-word in this doctrine of mystic realisation.

Comparison.

To the modern scientific mind all old religions are gradually losing their charms. Man has advanced to a considerable degree since the inception of these religions, and our ideas, and institutions, both social and political, have changed, so we cannot now be satisfied with the stereotyped dogmas of the old creeds. Even reformation that has been effected cannot keep pace with the progress of the modern scientific world. This has not escaped the notice

[1] রসরাজ মহাভাব নিত্য দোঁহ কর্ত্তা।
ইহার পর আর নাহি কহিলাম তত্ত্ব॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 60.

[2] This is from Mr. M. C. Ghose's article on Humanism (being a review of Humanist Sermons, edited by C. W. Reese) published in the Modern Review of January, 1929 (pp. 61-65). The quotations noted hereunder are also from that article.

of the thinkers of the age, and they have already set their hands to formulate schemes of ideal religions under the designations of Positivism, Humanism, etc., some ideas of which are incorporated in the Sahajiyā doctrine. Now, the Sahajiyā doctrine in its highest aspect is not Materialism (which may properly be contrasted with Animism) though it explains the happenings of nature in terms of the locomotion of materials, because the latter is mechanistic, while the former is spiritistic. It is also not Positivism "which is an artificial system substituting the worship of Humanity for the worship of God, and is an abstraction having no concrete counterpart in subjective reality." Humanism, on the other hand, being spiritistic in character "holds the organic, not the mechanistic view of life," and "with concrete counterpart in subjective reality" it seeks "the knowledge of man, and our duties towards him." The Sahajiyā doctrine, in its highest aspect, is also established on this principle, but it defines its scope on a wider basis. Though it aims at the knowledge of self with reference to external objects, and to other selves, yet it holds fast, not to the limited ideal of doing one's duties to mankind only, but to that of fulfilling one's obligations to the world at large. In this respect it has a wider outlook of the utility of spiritual consciousness.

An ideal religion.

Some thinkers have also advanced suggestions about an ideal religion of the future. The idea that there is "one omnipresent, eternal energy informing and inspiring the whole creation at every instant of time and thought is exactly what the Sahajiyās say about the living force of creation. About God and worship this ideal religion observes—" God in our religion is not an autocratic ruler of the universe. He is to us Loving Father, Loving Mother, and Loving Friend.

He is near to us; He is nearer than all; He is nearer than the nearest, even the idea "near and nearer" makes him distant. Only an external object can be near and nearer, but He is the eye of our eye, the mind of our mind, the self of our self. Divine worship does not mean to us an object homage to an autocrat; it is not slavery consecrated. Divine worship means the approach of the part to the whole, and the union of the part with the whole. It is the approach of a loving son to his Father and Mother; it is the loving approach of the Lover to his Beloved. Worship means Divine companionship and participation in the life of the Absolute."[1]

In Vaiṣṇavism the same ideal has been followed by discarding the Aiśvaryya conception of God, and by adopting Mādhuryya divided into Sakhya, Dāsya, Vātsalya and Madhura emotions. What is thus spoken of as the ideal religion of the future, resembles in essence the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism (Sahajiyā doctrine in particular) of Bengal, and we know that this ideal was preached by Caitanya in Bengal in the sixteenth century A.D., and by the Ālvār saints in the southern India a few centuries before.

Positivism and the Sahajiyā Cult.

Let us now return to Positivism. We have seen that it differs in spirit from the modern Sahajiyā doctrine of Bengal, but inspite of this essential difference there are certain points manifesting the characteristic tendencies of the two cults on which both of them are of the same persuasion—

1. The Sahajiyās advocate the way of love in preference to that of intellect or activity. On this point Positivism observes—" Individual happiness and public

[1] The Religion of Humanism. From a review by Mr. Mohesh Chandra Ghose, published in the Modern Review, January, 1929.

welfare are far more dependent upon the heart than upon the intellect. The only basis on which they (faculties of our nature) can be brought into harmonious union, is the preponderance of Affection over Reason, and even over Activity. Unity in our nature is then impossible, except so far as affection preponderates over intellect and activity. It is clear, therefore, that the first condition of co-operation must be sought in their (men's) own inherent tendency to universal love. It is henceforth a fundamental doctrine of Positivism......that the Heart preponderates over the Intellect."[1]

2. The Sahajiyās not only advocate the company of women as equal partners in spiritual culture, but it is also their favourite maxim that the man should adopt the nature of woman, to whom they, therefore, pay the respect of a Guru (or spiritual guide). On this point Positivism observes—"Woman is the purest and simplest impersonation of Humanity, who can never be adequately represented in any masculine form. In that (therefore) which is the great object of human life, they (women) are superior to men, or in other words, in the highest attributes of Humanity women are their (men's) superiors. The only element of our nature which is in itself moral is Love, for Love alone tends of itself towards the preponderance of social feeling over self-interest. In the first stage of progress there is no modifying power except what springs from Feeling. Positivism is based on the preponderance of affection in our nature. Such a principle is of itself an appeal to women to associate themselves with the system as one of its essential elements. Strong affection exercises

[1] From 'A General View of Positivism' by A. Comte (Translated by J. H. Bridges), pp. 15-18,

a marvellous influence upon mental effort. It elevates the intellect at once to the only point of view which is really Universal. The heart thus aroused will in its turn react beneficially upon the intellect, and it is specially from women that this reaction will proceed. By following out this principle, philosophical difficulties of the most formidable kind are at once surmounted. Stimulation of affection under feminine influence is, therefore, necessary. In a word, the new doctrine will institute the worship of women, publicly and privately, in a far more perfect way than has even before been possible. It is the first permanent step towards the worship of Humanity." [1]

3. The Sahajiyās ignore the social custom in order to create an atmosphere of individual freedom for spiritual advancement. In the system of Positivism it is also admitted that "the heart's only chance of growth lay in resistance to the established system." [2]

4. The Sahajiyās do not advocate religious austerities of any kind. On this point it is said that "Positivism is characterised always by reality, and admits of no degeneration into asceticism or quietism." [3]

5. The highest aspect of the Sahajiyā doctrine is based on the principle of observation. In Positivism also it is said that "the doctrine has to be demonstrated in all the more essential cases from observation only." [4]

6. In the domain of reality, the Sahajiyās consider Man superior to God. In Positivism also it is said that "the conception of God will be entirely superseded."

[1] *Ibid*, pp. 224-272.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 18.
[3] *Ibid*, p. 421.
[4] *Ibid*, p. 26.

It is further maintained that "towards Humanity, who is for us the only true Great Being, we, the conscious elements of whom she is composed, shall henceforth direct every aspect of our life, individual or collective. Our thoughts will be devoted to the knowledge of Humanity, our affections to her love, our actions to her service."[1] In a doctrine which is thus meant for the service of Humanity, Man is necessarily held in the fore rank, and the conception of God falls in the background. In the Sahajiyā literature also there are constant references to the superiority of Man. Caṇḍīdāsa says that in the domain of reality Man represents the highest truth, for there is nothing greater than him.[2] In one book, Nārāyaṇa is represented to have said that in man there is the best manifestation of creation.[3] In the possession of love, man is not only the very best in the creation, but he is superior to gods also, for, it is said that love is the divine inheritance of man only, but not even of the gods.[4] It is also said that the mysterious

[1] *Ibid*, pp. 349-350.

[2] চণ্ডীদাস কহে, শুনহ মানুষ ভাই।
সবার উপর মানুষ সত্য
তাহার উপর নাই ॥
Padāvali (P.E.), Song No. 809.

[3] নরমানুষের দেখ লীলা সর্ব্বোত্তম।
Sudhāmṛta-Kaṇikā, p. 5.

[4] মানুষ দেবের সার।
যার প্রেম জগতে প্রচার ॥
জগতের শ্রেষ্ঠ মানুষ যারে বলি।
প্রেম পীরিতি রসে মানুষ করে কেলি ॥
U. MS. No. 2383, Song No. 7.

character of man is not even known to Viṣṇu,[1] for he was obliged to incarnate himself as a man in order to taste the pleasures of love.[2] There is also an idea that God cannot enjoy himself except through creation.[3] At first He was alone, but when He experienced the desire of enjoyment, He multiplied Himself, and thus began creation.[4] It is, therefore, through creation only that God enjoys Himself. Just as the brain without the organs of the body can do nothing, so God without creation is merely a God in name. This is somewhat like what Tukārām says—" Know this, O God, that

Also

রসের মাধুরি সভা হতে ভারি
বুঝিতে শকতি কার।
এ রস বিরল অদ্ভুত সকল
ইহাতে মানুষ অধিকার॥
Ibid, Song No. 9.

1 মানুষ সেই জগতের সার।
লোচন কহে মহাবিষ্ণু না জানে
কেমনে জানিবে জীব ছার॥
Ibid, Song No. 11.

2 ঈশ্বর না হয় কভু জীবের সমান।
যার লোভে ঐশ্বর্য্য ছাড়িল ভগবান্॥
Ratnasāra, p. 40.

3 জনম নহিলে নহে লীলার আস্বাদ।
Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 61.

4 এক ব্রহ্ম যথন দ্বিতীয় নহে আর।
সেই কালে শুনি ঈশ্বর করয়ে বিচার॥
অপূর্ব্ব রসের চেষ্টা অপূর্ব্ব করণ।
কেমনে হইব ইহা করেন ভাবন॥
Ratnasāra, p. 178.

because we exist, God-head has been conferred on you."[1] Dr. Tagore also speaks in the same strain, thus—

আমায় নৈলে ত্রিভুবনেশ্বর
তোমার প্রেম হ'তো যে মিছে।

Gītāñjalī, Song No. 121.

In fact man alone can realise the idea of God,[2] so he has got this special privilege that by culture he can rise to the highest level of spirituality to which even the gods cannot go.[3]

Resumé.

The True Character of the Sahajiyā Doctrine.

We have seen that the Sahajiyās have adopted the ideal of Parakiyā, and that some of them take female companions for the sake of mystic spiritual culture. We have also pointed out that the women so taken are not used for gross enjoyment, and that there are strongest injunctions against the passionate indulgence of this kind. It is further stated that the services of women in mystic

[1] The Hindu View of Life, by Prof. Radhakrishnan, p. 30.

[2] নরবপু না হইলে তারে পাবে কতি।

Amṛta-rasāvalī, p. 10.

[3] অতএব সাধ মন মানুষ করণ।
ঈশ্বরের গণে নহে প্রাপ্ত বৃন্দাবন।

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 77.

And

ঈশ্বর মানুষ ভাব কভু নাহি পায়।

Ratnasāra, p. 5.

culture are simply means to an end like a traveller making use of a road to arrive at his destination.[1] We shall now see what is the true character of this culture, the details of which we have given above.

The principal aim of the Sahajiyā doctrine is the culture of one's own self,[2] and it is for this reason that the Sahajiyās repeatedly make the assertion that the human body must be the basis of spiritual culture.[3] The conception of individual existence brings in the idea of what is technically called Soul encased in the body. These two units, the body and the soul, are so correlated that for the purpose of keeping one's self alive the nourishment of the body is an absolute necessity and hence the Sahajiyās say that the Soul is maintained by the body.[4] This body is, therefore, an important factor in the conception of human existence to which the Sahajiyās have directed their attention for the sake of mystic culture.

Man is usually considered in what is his physical, moral, and intellectual nature, but the Sahajiyās, like the followers of other mystic cults, have conceived a fourth, namely, the psycho-physiological aspect of the human

1 রাগ সাধনের এমনি রীত।
সে পথি জানার যেমতি চিত ॥
Padāvalī of Caṇḍīdāsa, S. No. 786.

2 আপনা জানিলে তবে সহজ বস্তু জানে।
Amṛta-rasāvalī, p. 5.

3 ভজনের মূল এই নরবপু দেহ।
Ibid, p. 4.

4 ভূতাত্মার দ্বারে হয় জীবের পোষণ।
জীবাত্মার দ্বারে পরমাত্মার সেবন ॥
Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, p. 13.

body. We are here introduced to the ideas of various nerves, lotuses, *cakras*, ponds, *ghāṭas* and other mystic subtleties with peculiar spiritual significance attached thereto. These are called Ātmatattva or mystic particulars about self, the knowledge of which is sought for generating in the body a sort of mystic potentiality which opens the door of mystic realisation. In the sphere of this culture there is no conception about any god situated outside the human body, and it is believed that the union of the individual energy with the Supreme Energy located in the head brings in perpetual enjoyment characteristic of spiritual emancipation.

In that aspect of culture which deals with the physical tendency of man, the Sahajiyās do not acknowledge the utility of practising austerities and privations for spiritual gain.[1] They, however, believe that spiritual exercises in an atmosphere of favourable indulgence produce good result in effectively regulating the tendencies of man.[2] Holding fast to the view that this body is the proper field of culture, they look to the traditional five constituent elements of the body (such as earth, water, fire, air, and ether) as the first items of Sahaja culture.[3] Among the physical organs, nine, out of a total of eleven, have been adopted by them for regular culture. Of these nine, five (such as, eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin) are the outer

[1] ছাড় অন্য জ্ঞান কর্ম্ম বিধি আচরণ।
নাহি দেখ বেদ ধর্ম্ম স্বকীয়া সাধন ॥ Ratnasāra, p. 38.

[2] কায়িক ভজন হয় আনুকূল্য সেবা।
নিজাঙ্গ সপিলে বস্তু আবর্ত্তয়ে যেবা ॥ *Ibid*, p. 46.

[3] পঞ্চভূত পঞ্চজন দেহ ইথে হয়।
দেহের সাধন সহজ এই হেতু কয় ॥
Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī, p. 15.

senses otherwise called the organs of perception, and the four (such as, mind, egoism, intelligence and heart) are the organs of consciousness. The Sahajiyā works like the Amṛtarasāvalī and the Ānandabhairava have dealt with the culture of senses in the form of instructive parables.[1] Then comes the conception of the six natural enemies of man, such as, Kāma (cupidity), Krodha (anger), Lobha (greed), Moha (ignorance), Mada (pride), and Mātsaryya (envy). For advancement in the path of spirituality it is of primary importance that these evil tendencies should be effectively subdued. Kāma is by far the bitterest enemy of man, which has its abode in the body of flesh and blood, from which it is difficult to dislodge it. Working on the principle of indulgent culture, the Sahajiyās take female companions in spiritual exercises for the suppression of Kāma and making room for the growth of Prema or love.

In the sphere of moral culture, the Sahajiyās consider love to be the panacea of all evils. In fact, the Sahajiyā doctrine is based upon the ideal of the culture of love which is regarded as a natural characteristic of man. Love fully developed makes man resemble God by generating in him the sentiment of universal brotherhood. He is thus initiated in the doctrine of selfless actions, and elevated to the state of perceiving beauty in all objects of creation, thereby enjoying a full share of perpetual bliss which is the very nectar of spirituality. These are blossoms of perfection which grow from the culture of inner self.

[1] There is difference of opinion among the followers of different schools of thought as regards the number of organs. Some give preference to seven (*vide* Brahmasūtra, 2. 4. 4; Muṇḍ. Up., 2. 1. 8), others to eleven (5 organs of work, 5 organs of consciousness, and mind), and sometimes to nine and fourteen. The Amṛtarasāvalī has attached great importance to the training of the five senses, because they are considered inseparable companions of the Individual soul. Comp. the *Gītā*, 15. 8-9; Kaṭha Up., 2. 6. 10.

In the sphere of intellectual culture, the Sahajiyās do not enter into the labyrinth of theological discussions of intricate nature, but hold fast to the simple truth that man is born with the spark of God encased in the body. He, therefore, possesses divine qualities in him, the full manifestation of which is the *summum bonum* of human life. In a doctrine like this, the culture of self must necessarily be the first object of spiritual exercises. In viewing the mysteries of creation, the Sahajiyās maintain that the Eternal Matter and Energy are united in the inseparable bond of Parakīyā love, and this union is at the root of all creation. In nature nothing is born anew, and nothing dies, but there is simply change of forms, the production of new objects with the materials of the old ones. There is, therefore, no essential difference of any kind between one object and another, and this conception at once brings in the idea of immortality, and of universal brotherhood. This is the knowledge of the nature of self and its relationship with other objects of creation.

In the physical, moral and intellectual aspects of culture, the Sahajiyās have, therefore, one object in view, namely, the culture of self. This self they have made the subject of worship, for it is maintained that in the Parakīyā mode of culture the devotee does not worship God, but his own self.[1] It is for this reason that the Sahajiyās are not so very particular about God and His worship. But the true character of the Parakīyā culture can be explained on the principle of experimental psychology. The object of culture is to acquire the

[1] পরকীয়া ভাবনা করয়ে যেই জনা।
ঈশ্বর না মানে, জানে নিজ উপাসনা॥
U. MS. No. 591, p. 10.

knowledge of one's own self. This can be done effectively when the devotee is placed in the position of an observer making his own self the object of observation, like a man accommodating himself before a mirror. In practical culture women are taken for this purpose, for a man puts himself bare in his native form revealing his nature and tendency, his strength and weakness, to a woman with whom he preserves unreserved association. The woman then becomes the mirror before whom his true self is reflected in all its genuine colours.[1] A critical observer can mark the effect thus produced, and regulate his own tendencies for further betterment.[2] A female partner is, therefore, taken for the sake of knowledge about self.[3]

Even the same result is produced when instead of taking a woman in this way, the man transforms himself into a woman for self-study. In the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, Kṛṣṇa is represented to have made the following observations:—"When I look at my own image through a mirror I become captivated by my own beauty. I long to enjoy it, but fail in my purpose. When I think of the means of tasting it, I find that I can do so by transforming

1 দর্পণে দেখায় যৈছে আপনার মুখ।
গোপীভাব তৈছে ভজে কৃষ্ণ সেবা সুখ॥
Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 13.

2 প্রাকৃত দেহে যাজন করে, সে ভাব আপনাতে বর্ত্তে।
Sahajatattva, U. MS. No. 607, p. 5.

3 পরকীয়া স্বভাব করে মায়ার প্রকাশ।
আপনার জ্ঞান বৃদ্ধি এই অভিলাষ॥
Sudhāmṛta-Kaṇikā, p. 8.

myself into Rādhā."[1] This, in fact, is the true spirit of the Marma Parakīyā culture, which has been adopted by the Sahajiyās as a dogma in religion.[2]

---

[1] দর্পণান্তে দেখি যদি আপন মাধুরী।
আস্বাদিতে লোভ হয়, আস্বাদিতে নারি॥
বিচার করিয়ে যদি আস্বাদ উপায়।
রাধিকা স্বরূপ হৈতে তবে মন ধায়॥

Canto I, Chap. 4.

[2] পুরুষ ছাড়িয়া প্রকৃতি হবে।
এক দেহ কয়ে নিত্যেতে যাবে॥

Caṇḍīdāsa's Song No. 773.

CHAPTER V

SAHAJIYĀ LITERATURE.

I. Its Tendency.

Bharat.

In order to form some idea about the tendency of the Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā literature, it is necessary that a preliminary enquiry should be made about the nature of works that are usually quoted as authorities in the Sahajiyā books. Besides the Vaiṣṇava Gosvāmīs of Vṛndāvana the earlier author who is frequently referred to by the Sahajiyās is Bharata. In the Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, Rūpa writes:—

His identity.

ভারতাদ্যুক্তিরেষা হি প্রাক্তনৈরপ্যুদাহৃতা।

Dakṣiṇa, 5-51.

Commenting on this, an annotator has observed—

প্রাক্তনৈঃ শারীরকভাষ্যকারাদিভিঃ শাস্ত্রবিদ্ভিঃ।

which has been further explained in Bengali as—

শারীরক-ভাষ্যকার শাস্ত্রজ্ঞ শ্রীমৎশঙ্করাচার্য্য প্রভৃতি পণ্ডিতবর্গও ভরতাদি মুনির উক্তি উদাহরণ করিয়াছেন।

Further we find that Rūpa after making the remark noted above has quoted as an illustration a verse from the Udyoga-Parva of the Mahābhārata, and Rāmānuja in his comments on the verse 1-1-21 of the Brahma-Sūtra has quoted a verse of similar import from the same source. This leads us to suppose that Vyāsa, the author of the Mahābhārata, is meant by the term Bharata.

But the author of the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta evidently refers to Bharata, the author of the Nāṭyaśāstra, when he says—

ছুঁহার যে সমরস ভরতমুনি মানে।
আমার ব্রজের রস সেহ নাহি জানে॥

Canto I, Chap. 4.

perhaps because this Bharata is recognised as the founder of the Rasa School of India. But we have other Bharatas also mentioned in the legends and literature of the country, the saint Jaḍa Bharata being one of them. Later on, the term Bharata came to be used as a common epithet of works written on dramatic art, such as Mataṅga-Bharata of Lakṣaṇabhāskara, and sometimes it was used with the names of the authors of these books, such as, Arjjuna-Bharatam, meaning thereby the work written by Arjjuna.[1] The term Bharata thus came to be used as a common denomination. Let us now see what account we have in the Sahajiyā works about one Bharata who is so frequently mentioned by them. The Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī says that he was a son of Brahmā—

ব্রহ্মার মানস পুত্র ভরত নাম তার।
সহজতত্ত্বে বিজ্ঞ তিহো-সম নাহি আর॥ p. 23.

Also

ব্রহ্মার মানস পুত্র ভরত মহামতি।
সহজবস্তু সাধন কৈল কেবল পীরিতি॥

Ibid, p. 18.

[1] *Vide* Prof. Amulyachandra Vidyābhūṣaṇ's article on Bharata published in the Pravāsī, 1336 B.S., pp. 44-48.

In the Ānandabhairava it is said that the Sahajiyā doctrine was first adopted by the sage Bharata, and after him by Kṛṣṇa, Caṇḍīdāsa, Vidyāpati and others—

শ্রীকান্ত কহেন পদ্মা শুন আমার বাণী।
এই ধর্ম্ম জাজন কর‍্যাছিল ভরথ মুনি॥
কামরূপা মন্ত্রে তাহার উপাসন।
আপনে লিখিল তেহো আপন ভজন॥
স্বয়ং ভগবান কৃষ্ণ ব্রজেন্দ্র নন্দন।
তার চরিত্র গোসাঞী কর‍্যাছে লিখন॥
সেই অনুসারে বিদ্যাপতির করন।
চণ্ডিদাস সেই ধর্ম্ম করিল জাজন॥

U. MS. No. 3926, p. 7.

He is the first Sahajiyā author.

From the above, we also find that Bharata himself wrote a book about his own mystic culture. This is also supported by a statement of the Ratnasāra which says that previous writers did not distinctly write about Parakīyā, but an attempt in this direction was first made by Bharata—

পরকিআ রস পষ্ট কেহ না লিখিলা॥
ব্রজের মাধুর্য রস পরকিআ হয়।
তাহা পষ্ট মার্গ করি ভরথ লিখয়॥ p. 4.

A story is also narrated about the circumstances under which Bharata adopted the ideal of Parakīyā. Brahmā begot two sons, one of whom was called Bharata, and the other Manu. Being advised to procreate, Manu begot many children, but Bharata went to practise meditation on the bank of the river Revā. There he found in a thick forest of cane a mystic grove, where a youthful shepherd boy and a girl used to meet in secret. Their

love-amours surprised him, and he went to Nārāyaṇa in Goloka for the solution of the mystery. Having narrated what he had seen in the grove, he remarked that the ways of men seemed to him the best, even better than the austere practices he was following. The Lord admitted this, and said that his union with Rādhā in Goloka was symbolical of the union of the male and female elements of creation, a picture of which he had seen in the forest. Thereupon Bharata returned to his place of meditation, and adopted a sort of mystic culture based upon the ideal of conjugal love. The Lord, on the other hand, took birth in the Vṛndāvana to taste the pleasure of love with Parakīyā companions.[1]

1 মায়া সৃষ্টি কর বলি ঈশ্বর বলিল ।
ব্রহ্মা অন্তরে তখন ভাবিতে লাগিল ॥

* * *

তাহাতে হইল দুই পুত্রের জনম ॥
ভরত মনু দুই নাম দুজনার রাখিল ।
ব্রহ্মা কহে সৃষ্টিকর দোঁহে আজ্ঞা দিল ॥
মনু পরে করে বহু সংসার সৃজন ।
ভরত করিল তবে তপস্যায় মন ॥

* * *

রেবা নামে এক নদী চৌদ্দ ভুবনের মাঝে ।
দুই কিনারাতে তাহে বেতবন সাজে ॥
অতি সে নিগূঢ় বন কেহ যাইতে নারে ।
রহস্য এক কুঞ্জ আছে তাহার ভিতরে ॥
তাহার নিকটে পূর্ব্বে ভরত তপসী ।
ষাটী হাজার বৎসর তপস্যা করে বসি ॥
উইয়ের মাটীতে সর্ব্ব ঢাকিয়াছে অঙ্গ ।
নাগর নাগরী তথা দেখেন ভরত রঙ্গ ॥

A story somewhat of this nature about the love-affairs of a prince and a princess meeting secretly in a forest grove, is narrated in the Karṇānanda of Yadunandana Dāsa, about which we have spoken in Chapter II. It has been pointed out in that connection that a Sanskrit verse referring to such secret union is also found quoted in the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta (Canto II, Chap. 1), Kāvyaprakāśa (1-4), Sāhityadarpaṇa (1-10), and Padyāvalī (386). The tradition, therefore, had been a well-established one and of good antiquity. We also know that the name of a religious preacher called Bharata was not unknown even in China and Tibet.[1] The story of a Bharata had "become part and parcel of Tibetan folk-lore, and several entirely different versions of it" are in existence in that country. The substance of this story is that a sinful king was brought to his senses by his minister "who was Buddha himself transformed into an owl"[2] or Chom-dan-das transformed into a minister called Vg-ṭad.[3] This story bears striking similarity to that of Jaḍa-Bharata narrated in the Hindu Purāṇas.

গোপরূপে আসি দোঁহে করয়ে সঙ্গম।
দেখিয়া ভরত চিত্তে হইল বিভ্রম॥

* * *

না বুঝিতে পারি ভরত করিলা গমন।
গোলোক-নাথে গিয়া সব করে নিবেদন॥
নরমানুষের দেখি লীলা সর্ব্বোত্তম।
কন্দর্প মায়া আদি আকর্ষয়ে মন॥ etc.

Sudhāmṛta-Kaṇikā, pp. 3-7.

Also *vide* Ratıvılāsa-Paddhati, pp. 1, 4-7.

[1] J. R. A. S., 1912, pp. 1070-73.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 1071.

[3] J. A. S. B., 1891, Part I, p. 37.

In the Tibetan tale the summary of the doctrine preached to the king is this :—" If you of your own accord have come to believe in the *chhos*, then body and intellect both are annihilated by the mind. These and the vanities that are destroyed in the end, are (all) illusions. If you know the inner sense, then there remains nothing that could be called death, etc." [1] The meaning of the word *chhos* is 'a particular doctrine, tenet or precept,' or 'a mystical doctrine.' [2] So, we find that the name of Bharata is also associated here with a kind of mystic religion.

Nature of his work.

From the evidence of the Sahajiyā books it appears that they refer to a Sanskrit work written on the basis of the tradition noted above by one who called himself Bharata. We are also in a position to give some idea about some verses of this book as they are found quoted in the Sahajiyā literature. In describing the beginning of creation, it says—

আখ্যঃ সারস্বতে কল্পে কারণং করুণার্ণবম্ ।
দ্বিবপুর্ভাতি কথিতং প্রাকৃতাপ্রাকৃতং তথা ॥

Rativilāsapaddhati, p. 3.

আত্ত-সারস্বতকল্প-কারণং করুণার্ণবম্ ।
স্ববপুর্ভাতি দ্বিবিধা প্রাকৃতাপ্রাকৃতস্তথা ॥

Ratnasāra, p. 2.

The following verse was taught by Brahmā to Bharata—

জ্ঞানং পরমগুহ্যং মে যদ্বিজ্ঞানসমন্বিতম্ ।
সরহস্যং তদঙ্গঞ্চ গৃহাণ গদিতং ময়া ॥

Rativilāsapaddhati, p. 1.
Adopted from the Bhāgavata, 2-9-30.

[1] *Ibid*, p. 46.
[2] Tibetan-English Dictionary, by S. C. Dās, p. 428.

About the story narrated above, it is said—

নদ্যাঃ সমীপে কুঞ্জে যৎ নিভৃতং পরমং বনম্।
তস্য কুঞ্জে নায়িকায়া মিলনং ভরতস্য হি॥

Sudhāmṛtakaṇikā, p. 4.

গত্বা চ গোলোকং ধাম মুনির্দিব্যেন তেজসা।
যত্রাস্তে ভগবান্ কৃষ্ণোঽংশিন্যা রাধয়া সহ॥

Ratívilāsapaddhati, p. 4.

The Lord said—

এতদ্বিজানীহি নিত্যং গোলোকং মম ধামকম্।
নিত্যলীলা ভবেদত্র অংশিন্যা রাধয়া সহ॥

Sudhāmṛtakaṇikā, p. 5.

Bharata said—

বিদ্যমান ব্রজারণ্যে গোপেন্দ্র-নন্দনন্দনং।
অপ্রাকৃতা রূপ-চেষ্টা সাক্ষাৎ মন্মথ-মন্মথ॥

Ibid, p. 6.

The Lord said—

সত্যস্তো দ্বিজবরশ্রেষ্ঠ যদুক্ত নরলীলয়া।
স এবং গোপরূপেণ স্বয়ং কর্ত্তা বিরাজতে॥

Ibid, p. 7.

The Lord was bent upon tasting Sahaja love—

শ্রুত্বা ভরতবাক্যানি ভগবান্ নন্দনন্দনঃ।
ভূত্বা সহজরত্যাখ্যা প্ররভৎ মনুজো ব্রজে॥

Ibid, p. 8.

It is quite clear that these are quotations from a Sahajiyā work written in Sanskrit. We have seen that these verses are not found in the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata.

Perhaps a book on the mystic cult was written by a Bharata, about whom we do not know much.

In the Amṛtarasāvalī, Bharata is simply an allegorical representation. In the story narrated there (about which we have spoken above) one of the nine ascetics, who first followed the girl, is called Bharata.[1] It is further said that he entered into a forest, and wrote a book about his own doctrine, the substance of which can be found in the preliminary verses of the Āgamasāra.[2] Commenting on this, the Nigūḍhārthaprakāśāvalī says that Bharata represents human mind when it has acquired the knowledge of its own self, of the Supreme Self, and of the philosophy of love, etc.[3] Here Bharata is identified with the typical Sahaja man, and his real existence lies hidden behind the allegories of spiritual teachings.

The Rasa School.

Bharata, however, became a popular figure with the Vaiṣṇavas, because they belong to the Rasa School which, "so far as the extant works go, was founded by (Bharata) the author of the Nāṭyaśāstra. The central pivot round which the whole Rasa system revolves is the Sūtra "Vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṃyogādrasaniṣpattiḥ" which literally

[1] তার শিরে হস্ত দিয়া থুইল ভরত নাম। p. 17.

[2] দুর্গম বনের মধ্যে করিল প্রবেশ ॥
আপনার তত্ত্ব তিঁহ লেখেন আপনে।
আগমসার গ্রন্থের মঙ্গলাচরণে ॥ p. 19.

[3] নিজতত্ত্ব পরতত্ত্ব রসতত্ত্ব আদি।
সহজ আচারে মন নিষ্ঠা হৈল যদি ॥
তবেই তাহাকে কহে ভরত আখ্যানে ॥ p. 23.

And

ভরত নামে মন কহে করি নিবেদন। p. 24.

means that rasa results from the combination of determinants, as well as of the consequents and the secondary or accessory moods, with the permanent or dominant moods, called the sthāyi-bhāvas. The correct interpretation of this Sūtra of Bharata, and the detailed treatment of the theory of *rasa* has engrossed the best portion of numerous works, and it is not possible to convey a complete idea in a few lines. Only a bare outline is attempted here. The theory of *rasa* has a semi-physiological, semi-psychological basis, and tries to explain how human feelings and emotions are worked upon by poetry. There are certain permanent or dominant moods of the human mind (called sthāyibhāvas) which generally lie dormant but are roused when appropriate stimuli are applied. The stimuli in a poem are words alone. Just as a skilful painter produces the illusion of reality by means of a few colours, so the poet by words so rouses some of the dominant moods that for the moment the reader forgets himself and has æsthetic enjoyment of a particular kind. The resultant æsthetic enjoyment and pleasure are called Rasa.[1] It is undoubtedly a fact that the Vaiṣṇavas are the followers of this Rasa School. Caitanya during his spiritual ecstacies would always take delight in songs and poems which dealt with the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. The best literary productions of the followers of Caitanya are in the form of dramas and songs written on the same ideal. The Vidagdha-Mādhava, Lalita-Mādhava, Dānakelīkaumudī, Padmāvalī, Haṃsadūta, and the Uddhavasandeśa, etc., are works of this nature. The aim of these early compositions

[1] Sāhityadarpaṇa, by P. V. Kane, Introd., p. cxlvii. The philosophy of Rasa is treated in the Nāṭyaśāstra (Chaps. VI and VII), Daśarūpa (Prakāśa, IV), Sāhityadarpaṇa (III), Rasataraṅginī, Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, and Ujjvalanīlamaṇī, etc.

of the authors of modern Vaiṣṇavism has always been to create an atmosphere favourable for the enjoyment of divine Rasa by arousing the dominant moods that usually lie dormant for want of necessary stimuli. But later on a set of writers came in who were noted for their scholarly attainments. They, headed by Jīva Goswāmī, could not rest satisfied without bringing in abstract philosophy in the interpretations of the creed of Caitanya, obviously for the purpose of keeping it on the same level with the other branches of Vaiṣṇavism which are mainly based on the discussions of the dualistic theories. The works like the Kramasandarbha, Ṣaṭsandarbha, Sarvasaṃvādinī of Jīva are still pointed out by the modern Vaiṣṇavas as works of authority in justification of the philosophy of their faith. But they never represent the true spirit of the faith of Caitanya which is based on pure love, spontaneous and unqualified. The later Vaiṣṇavas have not followed in the footsteps of Jīva, for they have produced what is called the vast Padāvalī literature treating mainly of the love amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in the Vṛndāvana. The Sahajiyās in particular have held fast to the ideal of pure love, and it is, therefore, quite reasonable that they should particularly be fond of the name of Bharata who was the founder of the Rasa School to which they themselves truly belong.

References to Caitanya-Caritāmṛta.

Besides Rūpa and his colleagues, the author of the Post-Caitanya period who is frequently referred to in the Sahajiyā books is Kṛṣṇa Dās Kavirāj. His Caitanya-Caritāmṛta is the most popular work with the Sahajiyās.

কহিনু ব্রজের রস গৌরলীলা শুন ।
শ্রীকবিরাজ গোসাঞি গ্রন্থে লিখে পুনঃ পুনঃ ॥

বন্দ গোসাঞি কবিরাজ   লীলা কথা যার কাজ
গ্রন্থ কৈল চৈতন্যচরিত।
কৃষ্ণলীলা আস্বাদনে   গৌরলীলা উদ্ঘাটনে
জগতের যেই কৈলা হিত॥

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 2.

সর্ব্বরসতত্ত্বসার গ্রন্থ মহাশূর।
কবিরাজ গোসাঞির ইথে আশয় প্রচুর॥

Rasatattvasāra, 18.

জয় শ্রীকবিরাজ ঠাকুর কৃষ্ণদাস।
তোমার করুণাবলে করিয়ে প্রকাশ॥

Amṛtaratnāvalī, p. 1.

জয় জয় কবিরাজ শরণ তোমার।
তব পাদপদ্ম বিনে নাহি জানি আর॥

Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 2.

শ্রীকবিরাজ মহাশয়   করি তাঁর কৃপাশ্রয়
তাঁর শক্তি হইল সঞ্চার॥
সেই শক্তির সঞ্চার   বর্ণন করি যে তার
আমি অতি মূর্খ একজন।

Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, p. 29.

References of this nature are frequently met with in the Sahajiyā literature. Now, what is the cause of the Sahajiyā's thus referring to Kṛṣṇa Dās Kavirāj and his work Caitanya-Caritāmṛta? The reason is that Caritāmṛta is the first Bengali book that was written embodying the philosophy of the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism of Bengal as interpreted by Rūpa and his colleagues. The Caitanya-Bhāgavata is no doubt an earlier production, but it deals mostly with the bare facts of the life of Caitanya. As Vṛndāvana Dās, the

author of the book, did not come under the direct influence of the Gosvāmīs of Vṛndāvana, he could not embody much of the Post-Caitanya Vaiṣṇava philosophy in his work. To give a typical illustration, let us see what he says about the incarnation of Caitanya. He says that Caitanya was born to popularise the singing of Hari's name;

কলিযুগে ধর্ম্ম হয় হরি সঙ্কীর্ত্তন।
এতদর্থে অবতীর্ণ শ্রীশচীনন্দন॥

Canto I, Chap. 2.

But the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, while admitting this as one of the objects of Kṛṣṇa's incarnating himself as Caitanya, maintains that this was rather the secondary cause, while the primary object was, as we have pointed out in Chapter III, to see for himself how deeply he was loved by Rādhā, how charmingly beautiful he appeared to her, and how exhilarating was the pleasure she felt in his company. The writer also holds that this new philosophy was first preached by Svarūpa Dāmodara :—

অবতরি প্রভু প্রচারিলা সঙ্কীর্ত্তন।
এহো বাহ্য হেতু—পূর্ব্বে করিয়াছি সূচন।
অবতারের আর এক আছে মুখ্য বীজ।
রসিক শেখর কৃষ্ণের সেই কার্য্য নিজ॥
অতি গূঢ় হেতু এই ত্রিবিধ প্রকার।
দামোদর স্বরূপ হৈতে যাহার প্রচার॥

And

রাধাভাব অঙ্গী করি, ধরি তার বর্ণ।
তিন সুখ আস্বাদিতে হব অবতীর্ণ॥

Canto I, Chap. 4.

Kṛṣṇa Dāsa living in Vṛndāvana under the direct influence of the Gosvāmīs had the opportunity of being acquainted with their teachings which he embodied in his work. This is the reason of the great popularity of the Caritāmṛta which is the first work of its kind in Bengali. The Sahajiyās have, therefore, mostly quoted from this book, holding Kṛṣṇa Dāsa as a writer of authority in almost every matter.

Other works quoted.

Other works from which the Sahajiyās have quoted are Bhaktirasakārikā, Bhaktikalpalatikā, Premaratnāvalī, Padma-Purāṇa, Jaiminī-Bhārata, Bhāgavata, Gītā, Muktā-Carita, Bhṛṅgaratnāvalī, Gopīpremāmṛta, Rāgamālā, Ratikaumudī, Rasakaumudī, etc., most of which are Vaiṣṇava works. But among numerous Sahajiyā works that we have consulted we have rarely come across a quotation from any Buddhist Sahajiyā book, though there are frequent references to the Śaiva Tāntrik texts. The reason is quite clear. The Buddhist Sahajiyā Cult, as we find it explained in the Caryyā Padas, was a doctrine based on abstract philosophy similar to that of the Vedāntic school of India. It could not, therefore, find favour with the Vaiṣṇavas who discountenanced the way of knowledge, and adopted mainly the principle of love. Mereover, the Buddhist Sahajiyā works were perhaps little known to the Vaiṣṇavas as they are now to us. It is for these reasons that we have no reference to the Buddhist Sahajiyā doctrine in the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā literature.

2. *Identification and Chronology of the authors.*

Sahajiyā writers are many, and numerous are the works that are attributed to them. It is not possible to ascribe a definite date to each of them, for there are

generally scanty materials available to us for the purpose of fixing the chronology of the authors. Nevertheless, what can help us a little in this direction is the tendency of some writers to mention the names of their Gurus either in the colophons, or in the body of the book, with the object of pointing out the source of their information in justification of the authenticity of their faith. Let us take up a few cases of this nature. Besides Rativilāsapaddhati, Rasatattvasāra is a Sahajiyā work that is attributed to Rasika Dāsa. We have a copy of this book printed in the Baṭṭalā Presses of Calcutta. From the passages noted below we find that Rasika was a disciple of Mathurā Dāsa :—

শ্রীমথুরাদাস স্বামী তেঁহ কৃপা কৈল।
ছয় প্রমাণ দিয়া তত্ত্বাবলি এ কহিল॥
পরমাত্মা রূপ সেহ নিত্য দেহে রয়।
রসিক করণ সেই আমারে শিখায়॥
*   *   *   *
চৈত্যরূপ পরমাত্মা গুরু মথুরা দাস। p. 17.

In the colophon, the poet says—

শ্রীমুকুন্দ মথুরাদাস পদে করি আশ।
রসতত্ত্বসার গ্রন্থ কহে রসিক দাস॥

We thus find that Rasika was a disciple of Mathurā Dāsa, who was again a disciple of Mukunda, who, we know, was a pupil of Kṛṣṇa Dās Kavirāj, the author of the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta.[1] Kṛṣṇa Dās died towards the

[1] কবিরাজের মর্ম্ম শাখার করিয়া গণন।
*   *   *   *
মুকুন্দ কনিষ্ঠ শাখা সবার স্নেহের ভাজন।
কবিরাজ চাঁদের তেঁহ হন প্রাণধন॥
Vivarta-Vilāsa, p. 26.

close of the sixteenth century A.D.,[1] and Rasika was a disciple of his line, being removed from him by two Gurus intervening. Moreover, the manner in which Rasika has referred to Śrīnivāsa in his Ratīvilāsa-Paddhati, shows that he had great admiration for that Vaiṣṇava Saint who was perhaps alive during his lifetime.[2] If Śrīnivāsa died, as it is said, in 1610 A.D.,[3] then there is ample justification in placing Rasika in the first quarter of the 17th century A.D.

There is a Sahajiyā work named Siddha-Tīkā written by one who calls himself Raghunāth. That this author should not be mistaken for the celebrated Vaiṣṇava Gosvāmī of Vṛndāvana who bears the same name, will be quite evident from the fact that the writer has referred to that Raghunāth in this book, thus :—

সিদ্ধদেহে গুরুকৃষ্ণ বৈষ্ণব কারে বলি ?
শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ। p. 2.

He has also referred to Mukunda and Śrīnivāsa, thus :—

মানসিক নিত্যসিদ্ধা। মুকুন্দের আশ্রয়। p. 3.
তবে শ্রীনিবাস তারে শিক্ষা দেখাইল। p. 4.
সেই বস্তু শ্রীনিবাস সাধন করিল। p. 5.

We thus find that the author of the Siddha-Tīkā refers to both Mukunda and Śrīnivāsa with due

[1] He died in 1588 A. D. according to the testimony of the Vaiṣṇava-Digdarśanī, (p. 113), but Dr. D. C. Sen says that he died in about 1598 A. D. (Mediæval Vaiṣṇava Literature, p. 65).

[2] আচার্য্য ঠাকুর নাম শ্রীশ্রীনিবাস।
*   *   *   *
তাঁর চরণোদক মুঞি নিত্য করো পান॥

[3] Vaiṣṇava-Digdarśanī, p. 116.

reverance. Mukunda, we have seen above, was a disciple of Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj, and Śrīnivāsa was also in the position of a disciple of that saint, for when he went to Vṛndāvana for training Kṛṣṇa Dāsa was a venerable Vaiṣṇava living there. Mukunda is, therefore, a contemporary of Śrīnivāsa, and it is quite possible that our poet must have received inspiration from both of them. But who is this Raghunāth ? From the Karṇānanda (Berh. Ed., p. 10) we know that one Ragunāth was a disciple of Śrīnivāsa. As the author of the Siddha-Tīkā also respectfully refers to Śrīnivāsa in more than one places, we are led to believe that he was that Raghunāth who was a disciple of Śrīnivāsa. Now, Śrīnivāsa having died about 1610 A.D., Raghunāth may be supposed to have lived in the first quarter of the 17th century A.D., and this is the probable date of the composition of the Siddha-Tīkā. In the Calcutta University Library, we have in the MS. No. 1122 a copy of the Manaśikṣā attributed to Raghunāth, which is dated 1074 B.S., corresponding to 1667 A.D. The author must have lived before that date, and this justifies the conclusion we have arrived at.

Vivarta-Vilāsa is an important Sahajiyā work which is attributed to Akiñcana Dāsa. The book has been printed by the Baṭtalā Presses of Calcutta. In this book Akiñcana gives the names of two of his Gurus, as the following quotations will show—

বিবর্ত্তবিলাস এই করিএে বর্ণন।
শ্রীরসিকের পাদপদ্ম করিয়ে স্মরণ॥ p. 17.
সেই শ্রীরসিক চাঁদ পদে বেড়ি বেড়ি।
এইত হৃদয়ে আশা সতত আমারি॥

ঠাকুর রসিক বিনে লাভ যে কাহারে।
শ্রীগৌরাঙ্গ নিত্যানন্দ তাহারি শরীরে ॥ p. 151.
জয় জয় শ্রীযুত রসিক মহাশয়।
অনন্ত প্রণাম করি তব পাদদ্বয় ॥ p. 154.

But in the last two colophons, he says :—

শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ বিহারী পদে যার আশ।
অকিঞ্চন ইহা করি বিবর্ত্তবিলাস ॥ p. 156.

And

শ্রীবিহারীর পদে যেন মোর হয় আশ।
জন্মে জন্মে লাগে তার পদের বাতাস ॥ p. 154.

Thus, we find that Vihārī and Rasika are two Gurus of Akiñcana, one of whom was perhaps his Dikṣā (initiation) Guru, and the other his Śikṣā (training) Guru. The account that the poet has given us about the composition of the Vivarta-Vilāsa, shows that one Raghunāth was the Guru of his Guru from whom he received inspiration :—

আর এক চমৎকার কহি শুন ভাই।
যাহার কৃপাতে মুই হেন তত্ত্ব পাই ॥
আমার প্রভুর প্রভু রঘুনাথ নাম।
কহিয়ে তাহার কিছু শুন গুণগ্রাম ॥

* * * *

শ্রীপাট অম্বিকা বাগনাপাড়া গুণীগ্রাম।
তাহার নিকট গ্রাম নাহি কহিলাম ॥
সেই গ্রামে রহেন পরম আমার গুরু।
জীবের উপরে যেন বাঞ্ছাকল্পতরু ॥
আমারে করিলেন যেরূপে আজ্ঞাদান।
প্রকাশিয়া সেই গুণ শুন শ্রোতাগণ ॥ p. 145.

The poet then says that he learnt the doctrine from this Raghunāth who was the Guru of his Guru. Six months after his death Akiñcana came to his own village, and on the third night Raghunāth appeared to him in a dream and instructed him to write the Vivarta-Vilāsa. He narrated the incident to his Guru who also gave him permission to write the book—

এই স্বপ্ন প্রাতে মোর প্রভুকে কহিল।
শুনিয়া আমার প্রভু কান্দিতে লাগিল॥
কান্দিতে কান্দিতে মোরে করিলেন আজ্ঞা।
প্রভু যাহা কহিলেন সেই সে প্রতিজ্ঞা॥
করহ পালন তার আজ্ঞা যে নিশ্চিত। p. 149.

Let us now see what more we know about these Gurus. In the second chapter of the Vivarta-Vilāsa, the poet has given an account of the part taken by Mukunda in the composition of the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta. Kṛṣṇa Dāsa used to give his disciple Mukunda for inspection each chapter of the Caritāmṛta as soon as it was finished. Mukunda would secretly keep a copy of the same, and return the original to his Guru. When the work was completed, it was submitted for approval to Jīva Gosvāmī, but he threw it in the river Yamunā. Finding Kṛṣṇa Dāsa dejected over the loss of the book, Mukunda produced his own copy, and this satisfied the old man. It was this copy of Mukunda which was sent to Bengal, the original copy which was afterwards recovered remaining in Vṛndāvana. Akiñcana has thus given a new colour to the story of the composition and circulation of the Caritāmṛta which is not found in any other book, for all accounts go to show that it was the original copy which was sent to Bengal, and that there was no spare copy left when the original was lost. The poet has also

given a detailed account of the early life of Mukunda in this connection. The attempt thus made to heighten the importance of Mukunda creates the impression that Akiñcana was a disciple of the line of Mukunda. Now, from the Rasatattvasāra noted before, we know that Mukunda was the Guru of Mathurā Dāsa, who had as his disciple Rasika Dāsa, the writer of the book. We are led to believe that this Rasika was the Guru of Akiñcana, and that it was for this reason only that the latter took so much pain to raise Mukunda in the estimation of the Vaiṣṇavas. Akiñcana is, therefore, removed from Kṛṣṇa Dāsa by three Gurus intervening.

Let us turn to another account. From the Siddha-Tīkā and Karṇānanda noted above, we know that one Raghunāth was a disciple of Śrīnivāsa. From the Vivarta-Vilāsa also we know that one Raghunāth was the Guru of the Guru (who was perhaps Vihārī noted above) of Akiñcana. If these two Raghunāths be identified as the same person, then from Kṛṣṇa Dāsa we come to Śrīnivāsa, and then through Raghunāth and Vihārī to Akiñcana, who, in this calculation also becomes removed from Kṛṣṇa Dāsa by three Gurus intervening. Akiñcana might, therefore, have been living towards the middle part of the 17th century A.D.

Sahajatattva is attributed to Rādhāvallabha Dāsa. We have a copy of the work in the Calcutta University manuscript No. 607. The writer seems to be a disciple of Śrīnivāsa—

জয় জয় জয় মোর শ্রীশ্রীনিবাস।
নরোত্তম রামচন্দ্র দোহে জার দাস॥ p. 1.

Also—

কৃপা করে শ্রীনিবাস মোরে। p. 8.

In the Karṇānanda, we hear of one Rādhāvallabha Dāsa who was a disciple of Śrīnivāsa—

শ্রীরাধাবল্লভ দাস প্রভুর সেবক।
মহাভাগবত তিঁহ ভজন অনেক ॥

Berh. Ed., p. 14.

So, it is quite natural to suppose that this Rādhāvallabha was the author of the Sahajatattva. Śrīnīvāsa having lived upto about 1610 A.D., the date of the composition of the Sahajatattva may be fixed at about the first quarter of the 17th century A.D. It should be noted in this connection that we have a copy of a book named Sūcaka attributed to Rādhāvallabha Dāsa in the Calcutta University manuscript No. 1146 which is dated 1083 B.S., corresponding to 1676 A.D. Rādhāvallabha must, therefore, have lived before that date.

There are Sahajiyā works like Sādhana-bhakta-Kaḍacā (U. MS. No. 3983) and Dhātutattva Grantha (U. MS. No. 3886) which are attributed to Svarūpa Gosvāmī. This author is not that Svarūpa who was a constant companion of Caitanya. In the preliminary verses of the Sādhana-bhakta-Kaḍacā, the author invokes the aid of Rūpa and Sanātana, thus—

প্রভুর প্রিয়তম পাত্র শ্রীরূপ সনাতন।
এই মত জত জত আছে ভক্তগণ ॥
তারা মোর প্রাণধন রসিক সিরমনি।
কত গ্রন্থ বর্ণিলেন প্রেম রস খনি ॥ p. 1.

It is well-known that the mystic love of Caitanya was first interpreted by Svarūpa,[1] whose teaching was then adopted by Rūpa and Sanātana. They have extensively quoted from the Kaḍacā of Svarūpa in their works. Besides, Svarūpa died in 1533 A.D., before some of the important works of these two writers were completed. Under these circumstances, it is not possible that Svarūpa should refer to Rūpa and Sanātana in this manner. Moreover, the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā doctrine, as we have it now, was not even in the embryo at the time of Svarūpa. He cannot, therefore, be credited with the authorship of the two works we have mentioned above which are exclusively Sahajiyā in character. Who is then the author of these two books? In the Calcutta University Manuscript No. 3957 we have a Bengali translation of the Lalita-Mādhava of Rūpa rendered by one who calls himself Svarūpa Gosvāmī.[2] In the genealogy of his forefathers which he has given on page 137 of that book we find that he was eighth in descent from the saint Nityānanda (who passed away towards the middle part of the sixteenth century A.D.). Svarūpa Gosvāmī was, therefore, living (about 200 years later) by the middle of the eighteenth century A.D. If he is the author of Sādhanabhakta-Kaḍacā, then we can assume that this book was written at about this period.

The work Smaraṇaṭīkā otherwise called Campaka-kalikā is attributed to Jīva Gosvāmī (U. MSS. Nos. 3935,

[1] অত্যন্ত নিগূঢ় এই রসের সিদ্ধান্ত।
স্বরূপ গোসাঞি মাত্র জানেন একান্ত ॥

Cait-Carit., Canto I, Chap. 4.

[2] শ্রীললিত মাধব গ্রন্থ রসময়।
ভাষা করি শ্রীস্বরূপ গোস্বামি লেখয় ॥ p. 137.

and 1213). In the verse of invocation the author has bowed down to Jīva Gosvāmī along with Rūpa, Sanātana and other Vaiṣṇavas. We, therefore, conclude that he is not that celebrated Vaiṣṇava Gosvāmī of Vṛndāvana who was the author of many Sanskrit works, but some other person about whom we know very little.

Svarūpa-Varṇana (U. MS. No. 559) is attributed to Kṛṣṇa Dāsa. The author has referred to Śrīnivāsa and Naıottama thus—

গোপাল ভট্টের শিষ্য আচার্য্য শ্রীনিবাস।
তার সঙ্গে রহে সদা বৃন্দাবন দাস॥
লোকনাথ গোস্বামির শিষ্য কহি তার নাম।
ঠাকুর শ্রীনরোত্তম অতি অনুপাম॥

This shows that the book was written after Śrīnivāsa and Narottama had risen to fame. Now, the Gosvāmī Kṛṣṇa Dāsa was in the place of a Guru to Śrīnivāsa and Narottama, so he cannot refer to them in these terms. We, therefore, believe that the work was written not by the author of the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, but by some other person known as Kṛṣṇa Dāsa, a popular name which was borne by many Vaiṣṇavas of later time.

The test of Bhaṇitās.

A critical test can also be applied for the identification of authors by observing the nature of Bhaṇitās that were used by them. By looking into the Vaiṣṇava works we find that there was strict regularity in the manner of expressing oneself in the colophon, which was characteristic of each author. Caṇḍīdāsa and Vidyāpati are two noted Vaiṣṇava poets of the pre-Caitanya period. The former in his Kṛṣṇa-Kīrtana has invariably used the name of Vāsulī, the goddess he worshipped :—

বাশুলী শিরে বন্দী চণ্ডীদাস গাএ।

Vidyāpati usually speaks of the king Śiva-Siṃha, and his queen Lakhimā, thus[1] :—

ভণই বিস্তাপতি স্থন বর নাগর
সবহু হোয়ত পরকার।
রাজা শিবসিংহ রূপ নারায়ণ
লখিমা-কান্ত উদার ॥

In the post-Caitanya period, the poets of the first decade speak of the saints from whom they received inspiration, thus : —

Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj mentions Rūpa and Raghunāth—

শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ পদে যার আশ।
চৈতন্যচরিতামৃত কহে কৃষ্ণদাস ॥

Vṛndāvana Dāsa puts himself as—

শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য নিত্যানন্দ চান্দ জান।
বৃন্দাবনদাস তছু পদ যুগে গান ॥

Jayānanda uses the expression like—

চিন্তিয়া চৈতন্য গদাধর-পদ-দ্বন্দ্ব।
আদিখণ্ড জয়ানন্দ করিল প্রবন্ধ ॥

Locana Dāsa bows to Narahari—

শ্রীনরহরি দাস পদ করি আশ
লোচনদাস গুণ গায়।

In the Padāvalī (Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa songs) attributed to these two authors, there are Bhaṇitās of different kinds found in different Padas. In the midst of this confusion, the characteristic Bhaṇitās of these two poets are of the nature we have noted above. Besides, the whole Padāvalī literature has not yet been put to critical test for finding out the real author of the Padas. It is, therefore, better not to take the irregularities into consideration in speaking of the characteristic Bhaṇitās of these poets.

Narahari pays respect to Śrīnivāsa :—

শ্রীনিবাস আচার্য্যচরণ চিন্তা করি।
ভক্তিরত্নাকর কহে দাস নরহরি॥

Nityānanda Dās owes allegiance to Vīracandra and Jāhṇavā—

শ্রীজাহ্নবা বীরচন্দ্রপদে যার আশ।
প্রেমবিলাস কহে নিত্যানন্দ দাস॥

Yadunandana speaks of Hemalatā—

শ্রীআচার্য্য প্রভুর কন্যা শ্রীল হেমলতা।
প্রেম-কল্প-বল্লী কিবা নিরমিল ধাতা॥
সে দুই চরণ পদ্ম হৃদয়ে বিলাস।
কর্ণানন্দ রস কহে যদুনন্দন দাস॥

These are the characteristic Bhaṇitās of some of the earlier Vaiṣṇava poets. They usually speak of the gods and goddesses they worship, or of their patrons, and saints from whom they received inspiration. In fact, we find in none of the earlier Vaiṣṇava writers a tendency to express himself as the follower of a Mañjarī or Sakhī of Rādhā in the colophon. They were then under the living influence of the Vaiṣṇava Gurus whose authority they readily acknowledged in the colophons. But the dearth of such influential Gurus was felt later on, and a teaching like the following giving prominence to the Mañjarīs had greatly influenced the imagination of the people. The Caitanya-Caritāmṛta says :—

এবে এক সখীগণের ইহা অধিকার।
সখী হৈতে হয় এই লীলার বিস্তার॥

Canto II, Chap. 8.

The Sahajiyā writers have also declared that—

মঞ্জরি অনুগা বিনে বিষয়ের জ্ঞানে।
না পাইবে ভজিয়া সে শ্রীরাধারমণে॥

Rāgamayīkaṇā of Haridāsa
(B. E.), p. 2.

This idea of the utility of the Mañjarīs in the conception of spiritual love captivated the imagination of the Vaiṣṇavas of later days, and of the Sahajiyās in particular. The poets also fell a prey to this tendency, and they began to express themselves as the followers of the Mañjarīs in the colophons. The custom of Mañjarī-Bhaṇitā is, therefore, of comparatively later origin.

Now, we can apply this test in examining the works that are passing in the name of Narottama. The characteristic Bhaṇitā of this author is that he mentions the earlier Vaiṣṇava saints like Rūpa, Raghunāth, and Lokanāth in the colophons, thus—

রূপ রঘুনাথ পদে রহু মোর আশ।
প্রার্থনা করয়ে সদা নরোত্তম দাস॥

Prārthanā, Song No. 1.

শ্রীলোকনাথ ঠাকুর চরণ শরণ অভিলাস।
গুরুশিষ্যসম্বাদ কহে নরোত্তম দাস॥

U. MS. No. 558.

শ্রীলোকনাথ গোস্মামির পাদপদ্ম করি আশ।
রাধারসকারিকা কহে নরোত্তম দাস॥

Rādhārasakārikā.

বৈষ্ণব গোসাঞি কর ক্রিপা নিরক্ষণ।
বিকাইনু তব পায় দেহ প্রেমধন॥

রামচন্দ্র কবিরাজ মোর মোক্ষনাস।
উপাসনাতত্ত্ব কহে নরোত্তম দাস॥

U. MS. No. 557.

প্রভু সম্মতে কৈল রাগমালা প্রকাশ।
এই সব আখ্যান কহে নরোত্তম দাস॥

U. MS. No. 565.

It was quite natural for Narottama who had been brought up in the atmosphere of Vṛndāvana to mention the names of those saints under whose influence he had been trained. Yet there are works attributed to Narottama which have Bhaṇitās of different nature—

কোস্তুরি মুঞ্জরি পাদ পদ্ম করি ধ্যান।
সংক্ষেপে কহিল এই দেহের আক্ষান॥

U. MS. No. 613 (Dehanirṇaya).

শ্রীগুণ মঞ্জরি গুণের লহরি
স্মরণ জুগল জে॥
অনুগত বিনে এ সকল কথা
কারে না কহিবে ভাই।
নরোত্তম কহে মরম জানিলে
তাহারে কহিতে চাই॥

From the Deha-Tattva of Narottama.

অনঙ্গ মুঞ্জরি পাদ পদ্ম করি আস।
স্বরূপকল্পতরু কহে নরোত্তম দাস॥

U. MS. No. 2520.

শ্রীরূপ মঞ্জরি পাদ পদ্ম করি আশ।
চোমৎকারচন্দ্রিকা কহে নরোত্তম দাস॥

U. MS. No. 3098.

As there is thus great probability of the books like Rādhārasakārikā, Upāsanā-Paṭala, Rāgamālā, Upāsanā-tattva, Guru-śiṣya-sambāda and Premabhakti-Candrikā being actually written by Narottama, there is great doubt that he was the author of Dehanirṇaya, Dehatattva, Svarūpakalpataru, and Camatkāra-Candrikā noted above.

It is stated in the Premavilāsa (Chap. XII) that Narottama received the appellation of Campaka-Mañjarī from Rādhā, and that the name of Vilāsa-Mañjarī was conferred on him by Jīva Gosvāmī. He could thus use either of these two names in the colophons, but from his authentic works we find that he preferred neither of them to the names of the Vaiṣṇava masters like Rūpa, Sanātana and Lokanāth who were perhaps the great fountain-heads of his inspiration. In the colophons he bows down to these saints, and this is the true character of his Bhaṇitās. We cannot, therefore, understand why he should go out of his accustomed way to mention the Mañjarīs in the colophons. Besides, the custom is that one must scrupulously follow a Mañjarī to whom he owes allegiance, but in the colophons noted above we find Kastari-Mañjarī, Guṇa-Mañjarī, Rūpa-Mañjarī, and Anaṅga-Mañjarī mentioned in different books. This is not warranted by the practice of the Vaiṣṇavas. We are, therefore, led to believe that some of the works attributed to Narottama are the works of some other persons about whom we know nothing definitely.

Thus far about the negative evidence of the Bhaṇitā-test. We may reasonably entertain doubt about the identity of the same author when we have different works with dissimilar Bhaṇitās passing in the name of the same person. But, as we find in mathematics that the converse of a true theorem is not always true, so the positive

evidence also cannot be always relied on, by which we mean that the same Bhaṇitā used in different books is not always a guarantee about the identity of the authors. A later writer may be inclined to imitate the Bhaṇitā of a celebrated author in order to pass his own composition with the stamp and authority of his distinguished predecessor. This may become a necessity with the promulgators of a new faith when a particular doctrine has to be put forth for popular acceptance in the name of a distinguished person of a previous decade. Instances of this nature are not so very rare in Sahajiyā literature.

Ratnasāra is a Sahajiyā book which is attributed to Kṛṣṇa Dāsa. The author of the work is very zealous to publish himself as the same person who wrote the celebrated Caitanya-Caritāmṛta. He has imitated the characteristic Bhaṇitā of that Vaiṣṇava master, thus :—

শ্রীরূপ রঘুনাথ পদে যার আশ।
রত্নসার রত্নগ্রন্থ কহে কৃষ্ণ দাস ॥

We find that the same formula has been invariably used by the author of the Caritāmṛta with the exception of the name of the book put at the beginning of the second line.

The poet also repeatedly asserts in the Ratnasāra that he himself wrote the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta—

ইহা স্পষ্ট লিখিয়াছি শ্রীচরিতামৃতে। p. 4.
ইহার সিদ্ধান্ত লিখিয়াছি আদি খণ্ডে ॥ p. 5, etc.

Inspite of these positive proofs we are unwilling to believe that the book was written by Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāj Gosvāmī. In the second chapter of Ratnasāra the author has spoken about the necessity of adopting Parakīyā companions for practical culture. We have

already seen that the Vaiṣṇavas did not like this sort of culture. Though they had adopted the Parakīyā ideal in religion, they did not countenance practical culture of love in the company of women. It was mainly in this respect that they differed from the Sahajiyās. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāj who was brought up in the atmosphere of Vṛndāvana under the influence of the Gosvāmīs, cannot be expected to have written anything about a subject which they did not approve. Besides, the author of the Ratnasāra is such an ardent advocate of practical culture that he has attributed a Prakṛti (woman) to Caitanya in justification of the principle that he was preaching. This is a base allegation, the like of which we usually find in the writings of the later Sahajiyās. We cannot believe that the author of the Caritāmṛta had gone so far as to throw dust on the face of the idol he was worshipping with reverence.

The reason advanced for the composition of Ratnasāra is that a real necessity was felt for a book of this nature dealing with the practical side of mystic culture, as the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta could not satisfy that need. The author says—

শ্রীচৈতন্য চরিতামৃতে প্রলাপ লিখিল ।
বৈধি জড় হেতু ধর্ম্ম আচ্ছাদন কৈল ॥
লিখিয়া সহজ বস্তু সংক্ষেপে রাখিল ।
এই হেতু এই গ্রন্থে প্রকাশ লিখিল ॥

Ratnasāra, p. 18.

We have already noted a similar assertion made by the author of the Amṛtarasāvalī, thus—

চৈতন্যচরিতামৃতে সহজ সংক্ষেপে লিখিল ।
জীবের ডরে গোসাঞি জিউ লিখিয়া ঢাকিল ॥ etc.

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 3.

If Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāj had really written a book like Ratnasāra, Mukunda, the author of the Amṛtarasāvalī, could have mentioned that book as an authoritative work while referring to Bhaktikalpalatikā, Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, and the Premaratnāvalī attributed to Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāj.[1] This shows that Ratnasāra was unknown to the author of the Amṛtarasāvalī when he was writing that book. We also know that Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāj was very old when he was writing the Caitanya-Caritāmṛta. He was completely overtaken by the infirmities of old age at that time, and he feared he would not be able to finish the work.[2] Under these circumstances it is not easy to believe that he could ever tax his energies to write a book like Ratnasāra after the production of his master-piece when he had practically come to the end of his life. The fact is that he never wrote it, and it was for this reason that Ratnasāra was not mentioned in Amṛtarasāvalī along with Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, as well as in the list of the

[1] ভক্তি কল্পলতিকাতে দেখ বিচার কর‍্যা।
সহজ ভাঙ্গিতে প্রভু কলম নিল কাড়্যা॥
চৈতন্যচরিতামৃতে সহজ সংক্ষেপে লিখিল।
*   *   *   *
প্রেমরত্নাবলীতে সহজ ভাঙ্গিতে।
অচৈতন্য হয়্যা তিঁহ পড়িল মূর্চ্ছিতে॥ etc.

Amṛtarasāvalī, p. 3.

[2] বৃদ্ধ জরাতুর আমি অন্ধ বধির।
হস্ত হালে, মনোবুদ্ধি নহে মোর স্থির॥
নানা রোগগ্রস্ত চলিতে বসিতে না পারি।
পঞ্চরোগের পীড়ায় ব্যাকুল রাত্রি দিনে মরি॥

Cait.-Carit., Canto III, Chap. 10.

earlier Sahajiyā works as supplied by the Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī about which we have spoken before.

The name Kṛṣṇadāsa was so popular with the Vaiṣṇavas that the editor of the Vaiṣṇava-Abhidhāna has given particulars about 28 persons who bore that name. Many of them were noted for their learning and devotion, and it is quite possible that one of them might have set his hands to the compilation of the work giving details of the faith he was following. So there is no reason to go back to the author of the Caritāmṛta whenever we come across a writer who bears the name of Kṛṣṇadāsa. Careful scrutiny may clear up atmosphere for the identification of these persons. Harināma-Kavaca is attributed to Kṛṣṇadāsa. We have several copies of the work in the Calcutta University manuscript library. In the MS. No. 2361 the poet says—

অবৈষ্ণবে কদাচিত না করিহ প্রকাশ।
নিবেদন পুন পুন কহে কৃষ্ণদাস॥ p. 10.

But in the MS. No. 1793, these two lines appear as —

অবৈষ্ণবে কদাচিত না কর প্রকাশ।
নিবেদন করি কহে গোপী কৃষ্ণদাস॥ p. 4.

We thus find that the book written by one known as Gopīkṛṣṇadāsa has been attributed to Kṛṣṇadāsa in the MS. No. 2361.

In this way many difficulties can be cleared up. The authors of many Sahajiyā works have names like Raghunātha, Kṛṣṇadāsa, Narottama, Svarūpa and Jīva, but they for that reason should not be identified with the celebrated Vaiṣṇava saints bearing those names. It is not possible for us to deal with every author and with every Sahajiyā book, but the hints that we have given may be profitably utilised for the purpose of identification.

3. *Authors and Works attributed to them.*

We shall now refer to a great difficulty that we have keenly experienced in course of our investigation. The Sahajiyā sect possesses a vast literature but its circulation is mainly confined to its followers, for the Sahajiyā authors enjoin strictest secrecy about their religious books. This literature is mainly preserved in manuscript form in the huts of the followers of the sect, inaccessible to those who are outside the pale of their religion. The manuscripts are so jealously guarded that inspite of the vigilant activities of the Baṭtalā Presses of Calcutta printed copies of only a limited few are now available to the public. It is not possible to state with certain accuracy the number of books that have already seen the light in this way, but it is undoubtedly true that there must be many hundreds still unknown to the public, which if published will be a valuable acquisition for the study of Indian religious literature. The difficulty that we have experienced is the want of definite information about the available sources of these books, and we would have been greatly handicapped in our research if the collection of the Calcutta University had not been available to us. In order to remove this want we give below a list of about 250 books of the supplementary Vaiṣṇava literature, most of which are of Sahajiyā character. The figures in the right hand refer to the numbers of the manuscripts in the library of the University of Calcutta, and the books marked with asterisks are those that we know have been printed by the Baṭtalā Presses.

LIST OF WORKS AND AUTHORS.

N. B.—In order of Sanskrit Alphabet.

Akiñcana Dāsa.

1. *Vivarta-Vilāsa.
2. Bhaktirasātmikā—1153.
3. Rasakalikā—1943.

Ānanda Dāsa.

4. Rasa-Sudhārṇava—1276.

Uttama Dāsa.

5. Rasa-Tattva-sāra—3222.

Kavi-Vallabha.

6. Rasakadamba—3174.

Kṛṣṇadāsa.

7. Advaita-Sūtra-Kaḍacā—3958.
8. Avatāra-Varṇan—3985.
9. Ādya-Sārasvata-Ṣolakalā—3916.
10. Ātma-Jijñāsā—610.
11. *Ātma-Tattva—3888.
12. Ātma-Nirūpaṇa—1140.
13. Ātma-Sādhanā—2408.
14. Āśraya-Nirṇaya—1139.
15. Guru-Bhakti-Tattva-Nirūpaṇa—3212.
16. Guru-Śiṣya-Sambāda—1289..
17. Gauḍa-Gaṇoddeśa-Dīpikā—3214.
18. Gopī-Upāsanā—2620.
19. Govinda-Maṅgala—1006.
20. Caitanya-Tattvasāra—3156.
21. Caitanya-Vilāsa-Sindhu—1789.
22. Causaṭṭi-Daṇḍera-Sevā—2874.
23. Jñānaratnamālā—2357.
24. Tattva-Niryyāsa—1675.
25. Daṇḍātmikā—1397.

26. Navatattva—3887.
27. Nārada-Sambāda—1916.
28. Nigūḍha-Tattvasāra—2337.
29. Nindakasāra-Cintāmaṇī—3614.
30. Pañcarasa-Paṭala—2350.
31. Pāṣaṇḍa-Dalana—1205.
32. Purāṇa-Pramāṇa—1886.
33. Premaratnāvalī—1621.
34. Vaiṣṇava-Māhātmya—2796.
35. Vṛndāvana-Dhyāna—1446.
36. Vṛndāvana-Nirṇaya—1128.
37. Vṛndāvana-Līlā—1388.
38. Vṛndāvanayātrā-Parikramā—1616.
39. Bhaktirasa-Kaumudī—2526.
40. Bhaktirasātmikā—2317.
41. Bhajanakrama—2340.
42. Manovṛtti-Paṭala—2861.
43. Mīrābāyer-Kaḍacā—3608.
44. *Rasakadambakalikā.
45. Ratnasāra—1111.
46. Rasavastu—3193.
47. Rasasāra—3814.
48. Rasamaya-Candrikā—2348.
49. Rāgamayī-Kaṇā—571.
50. Rāgaratnāvalī—2530.
51. Rādhārasakārikā—2862.
52. Lalita-Mādhava-Grantha—2224.[1]
53. Śatanāma—1890.
54. Śyāmānanda-Prakāśa—1891.
55. Sahaja-Vastu-Tattvasāra—1393.
56. Sādhya-Sādhana-Tattva—1254.
57. Siddhānta-Kārikā—'856.
58. Siddhināma—2371.
59. Sūcaka—1887.
60. Sudhāsāra—2777.
61. Sevānirṇaya· 2776.

[1] Not by Rūpa.

62. Svarūpa-Nirṇaya—1193.
63. Svarūpa-Prakāśa—2694.
64. Svarūpa-Varṇana—559.
65. Harināma-Kavaca—2361.

Kṛṣṇamohana Dāsa.

66. Bhakti-Mañjarī—2589.

Kṛṣṇahari.

67. Sādhana-Nirṇaya-Tattva—576.

Gaṅgārām.

68. Sādhana-Tattva-Dīpikā—2524.

Govinda Dāsa.

69. Āgama—1280.
70. Ātmarasa—1127.
71. Nigama—1118.

Gaurīdāsa.

72. Nigūḍhārtha-Prakāśāvalī (Sāhitya Pariṣad MS. No. 1525).

Ghanaśyāma Dāsa.

73. *Govinda-Ratimañjarī—2147.

Caṇḍīdāsa.

74. Anusāra—3609.
75. Caitya-Rūpa-Prāpti—561.
76. Chaya-Tattvera-Anusāra—2781.

Caitanya Dāsa.

77. Āśraya-Nirṇaya—626.

Jagadānanda.

78. Sukha-Candrodaya—1167.

Jagat Rāma.

79. Ātma-Vodha—1318.

Jagannātha Dāsa.

80. Tattva-Kathā—1229.
81. Rasojjvala—598.

Jayakṛṣṇa Dāsa.

82. Bhajana-Ratna—1385.

Jīva Gosvāmī.

83. Kṛṣṇa-Bhakti-Parāyaṇa—602.
84. Campaka-Kalikā—3935.
85. Vraja-Kārikā—2223.
86. Muralī-Campaka—3994.
87. Rāgamayī-Kaṇā—1218.
88. Sahaja-Kalikā—2828.
89. Smaraṇīya-Ṭīkā—1213.

Taraṇī Ramaṇa.

90. Caṇḍīdāsa-Nakula-Sambāda—3437.

Dhanañjaya Dāsa.

91. Kṛṣṇa-Bhakti-Rasa—1183.

Nandakiśora Dāsa.

92. Vṛndāvana-Līlāmṛta—2188.

Navakiśora Dāsa.

93. Bhāva-Candrodaya—3145.

Narasiṃha Dāsa.

94. Darpaṇa-Candrikā—1701.

Narahari Dāsa.

95. Premāmṛta—2123.

Narottama.

96. Abhirām-Paṭala—1312.
97. Āśraya-Tattva-sāra—3748.

98. Āśraya-Nirṇaya—589.
99. Upāsanā-Paṭala—557.
100. Kākaḍā-Vicha-Grantha—2533.
101. Kuñja-Varṇana—1150.
102. Guru-Tattva—3931.
103. Guru-Bhakti-Candrikā—1665.
104. Guru-Śiṣya-Sambāda—567.
105. Caturdaśa-Paṭala-1413.
106. Camatkāra-Candrikā—1248.
107. Daśama-Paṭala—3269.
108. Deha-Kaḍacā—593.
109. Dhyāna-Candrikā—3910.
110. Nāma-Saṅkīrtana—1447.
111. *Prārthanā—1257.
112. *Prema-bhakti-Candrikā—1121.
113. Prema-bhakti-Cintāmaṇī—3928.
114. Prema-bhakti-Tattva—1293.
115. Prema-bhāva-Candrikā —3934.
116. Prema-Madāmṛta—1212.
117. Prema-Sādhya-Candrikā—2034.
118. Vraja-Nigūḍha-Tattva—3390.
119. Vrajapura-Kārikā—3523.
120. Bhakti-Uddīpana—1256.
121. Maṅgalārati—3428.
122. Maṇi-Mañjarī—2117.
123. Rasatattva—2783.
124. Rasapura-Kārikā—1161.
125. Rasa-bhakti-Candrikā—3362.
126. *Rasaratnasāra.
127. *Rasasāra.
128. Rāgamālā—565.
129. Rādhā-Tattva—1274.
130. *Rādhārasa-Kārikā—562.
131. Rāsa-Līlā-Tattva—1448
132. Vaiṣṇavāmṛta—1190.
133. Vastu-Tattva—3881.
134. Sikṣā-Tattva-Dīpikā—623.
135. Sahaja-Paṭala—4020.

136. Smaraṇa-Maṅgala—1162.
137. Smaraṇīya-Ṭīkā—3629.
138. Svarūpa-Kalpataru—2520.
139. Sādhana-Ṭīkā—3877.
140. Sādhya-Prema-bhakti-Candrikā—585.
141. Sādhya-Sādhana-Grantha—2673.
142. Hāṭapattana—2275.

Nayanānanda Dāsa.

143. Bhakti-Rasārṇava—2625.

Nityānanda Dāsa.

144. Rasakalpasāra—1702.

Nīlāmbara Dāsa.

145. Sudhāsāra—1200.

Parāṇa Dāsa.

146. Rasa-Mādhurī—3289.

Pitāmbara Dāsa.

147. Rasa-Mañjarī—1444.

Prema Dāsa.

148. Ānanda-Bhairava—3926.
149. Manaśikṣā—1304.
150. Raghunātha Dāsera Sūcaka—1683.

Valarāma Dāsa.

151. Upāsanāmṛta—3151.

Vaiṣṇava Dāsa.

152. Sādhya-Sādhana-Tattva—1604.

Vaṃśī Dāsa.

153. Gaura-Līlāmṛta—3996.
154. Dvīpakojjvala - 564.
155. Nikuñja-Rahasya—1792.
156. Rasāmṛtasāra—2536.

Vṛndāvana Dāsa.

157. Āgama—1962.

158. Ānanda-Laharī—1317.
159. Gopīkā-Mohana—1842.
160. Tattva-Vilāsa—1315.
161. Tattva-Mañjarī—1978.
162. Bhakti-Cintāmaṇī—1314.
163. Rasakalpasāra—1219.

Vrajakṛṣṇa Dāsa.

164. Gopī-Upāsanā—1622.

Bhakti Dāsa.

165. Vaiṣṇavāmṛta—2177.

Bhāgavata Dāsa.

166. Rāgānugā-Vṛtti—2529.

Mathurā Dāsa.

167. Ānanda-Laharī—1222.

Manohar Dāsa.

168. Āśraya-Kalpa-Latikā—3346.

Mukunda Dāsa.

169. *Amṛtaratnāvalī—595.
170. Amṛtatoṣiṇī—1217.
171. *Amṛtarasāvalī—577.
172. *Ādya-Sārasvata-Kārikā.
173. Camatkāra-Candrikā—1117.
174. Deha-Nirṇaya—622.
175. Prema-mālā—1243.
176. *Bhṛṅga-Ratnāvalī.
177. Maṅgalarasa-Kārikā—1633.
178. Rasa-Sāgara-Tattva—2767.
179. Rāga-Vṛttānta—1674.
180. Vaiṣṇavāmṛta—1202.
181. Sādhana-Tattva—1297.
182. *Siddhānta-Candrodaya—616.
183. Sārasvata-Kārikā—1968.

Yugalakiśora Dāsa.

184. Caitanya-Kārikā—580.

Raghunātha Dāsa.

185. Ātma-Nirṇaya—1949.
186. Āropa—3404.
187. Mana-Śikṣā—1300.
188. Rāga-Kārikā—2112.
189. Siddha-Ṭīkā—570.
190. Siddhānta-Ṭīkā—3913.

Ratna Dāsa.

191. Bhajana-Tattva-sāra—1947.

Rasamaya Dāsa.

192. Rasa-Tattva-sāra—2120.
193. Sūcaka—1159.

Rasika Dāsa.

194. Bhāgavatāmṛta-Kaṇā—2856.
195. *Rati-Vilāsa-Paddhati—586.
196. *Rasatattvasāra.

Rasika Rāja.

197. Rāgānuga-Vidhi-Tattva—618.

Rasika Lāla-Candra.

198. *Mīrābāyera-Kaḍacā.

Rādhāmohana Dāsa.

199. Rasa-Tattva-Kalpa—1959.

Rādhāvallabha Dāsa.

200. Vilāpakusumāñjalī—1152.
201. Sahaja-Tattva—607.
202. Sūcaka—1146.
203. Smaraṇa-Maṅgala—1618.

Rājārāma Datta.

204. Bhakti-Mañjarī—2170.

Rāmagopāla Dāsa.

205. Caitanya-Tattva-sāra—1126.
206. Svarūpa-Nirṇaya—3143.

Rāma Candra Dāsa.

207. Guṇātmikā—600.
208. Siddhānta-Candrikā—1186.
209. Smaraṇa-Darpaṇa—1267.

Rāmānanda.

210. Marma-Nirūpaṇa—2789.

Rūpa Gosvāmī.

211. Upāsanā-Kāṇḍa—1157.
212. Gītāvalī—3974.
213. Cātuṣpuṣpāñjalī—1208.
214. Caitanya-Tattva—3907.
215. Nikuñja-Vilāsa—1282.
216. Siddharati-Prāpti—1547.
217. Sūryyamāla-Grantha—1885.
218. Smaraṇa-Maṅgala—3975.

Rūpānuga Dāsa.

219. Nāyikā-Sādhana-Ṭīkā—3906.

Lakṣīkānta Dāsa.

220. *Sudhāmṛta-kaṇikā.

Locana Dāsa.

221. Ānanda-Latikā—1148.
222. Gorāguṇa—3142.
223. Caitanya-Caritra—2016.
224. Caitanya-Premavilāsa—2267.
225. *Durlavasāra—1132.
226. Dehanirṇaya—1939.
227. Vṛhat-Nigama—3456.
228. Rasakalpalatikā—615.
229. Rāgānugā-Prakāśa—2662.
230. Rādhākṛṣṇa-Līlārasa-Kadamba—3817.
231. Rādhārasa-Kārīkā—1114.

Śyāmānanda Dāsa.

232. Sādhaka-Siddha—2596.

Svarūpa Gosvāmī.

233. Sādhana-Bhakti-Kaḍacā—3983.
234. Dhātu-Tattva—3886.

Svarūpānanda.

235. Bhakti-Kalpa-Latikā—3989.

Haridāsa.

236. *Rāgamayīkaṇā.

Hāsyavadana Gosvāmī.

237. *Vṛhat-Prema-bhakti-Candrikā.
   (In the possession of Prof. Dhirendranath Banerjee, M. A., of the Bangabāsi College, Calcutta.)

[Of unknown authors.]

238. *Svarūpa-Dāmodarer-Kaḍacā.
239. *Bhogamālā.
240. *Vīrabhadrera-Kaḍacā.
241. *Pañcatattva Grantha.
242. Rūpānuga-Bhajana-Darpaṇa (a MS. in the possession of Mr. S. K. Das of the Pravāsī Office).

INDEX OF BOOKS REFERRED TO

(Arranged alphabetically)

GENERAL INDEX

R

T

Y

Z

CORRIGENDA

Page	*Line*	*Read*	*For*
14 ...	12 ...	Nadīyā ...	Nadia
23 ...	14 ...	Nadīyā ...	Nadīā
24 ...	13 ...	Sac-cid- ...	Sāc-cid-
80 ...	7 ...	Vṛhat- ...	Bṛhat-
101 ...	3 ...	no binding ...	his no binding
,, ..	4 ...	his vow ...	vow
135-142	...	Bauddha Gāna O Dohā ...	Bauddha Gāna and Dohā
175 ...	Last line ...	Rūpānuga- ...	Rāgānugā-
217 ...	9 ...	luxuriant ...	luxurint
261 ...	Margin ...	Bharata ...	Bharat

Wealth and Welfare of the Bengal Delta (*Thesis approved for the Degree of Doctor of Science in the University of London*), by S. G. PANANDIKAR, M.A., Ph.D. pp. 372. 1926. Rs. 5-0.

Lectures on Indian Railway Economics, by S. C. GHOSH, Lecturer, Calcutta University ; late General Manager of the B. K., A. K., K. F., and B. D. R. Rys. ; and also for sometime Special Officer with the Railway Board, Government of India, Railway Department.

Do. PART I. Second Edition (*thoroughly revised*). Demy 8vo, pp. 132. 1927. Rs. 2-0.

Do. PART II. Demy 8vo, pp. 98. Rs. 3-0.

Do. PART III. Demy 8vo, pp. 166. Rs. 3-0.

Organization of Railways, by the same author. Demy 8vo, pp. 32. 1927. Rs. 1-8.

Protection for Indian Steel, by E. H. SOLOMON, B.A. (Cantab.), sometime Scholar of King's College, Cambridge ; Professor of Political Economy, Presidency College, Calcutta, and Benares Hindu University. Royal 8vo, pp. 120. Rs. 5-0.

Present-Day Banking in India, by B. RAMCHANDRA RAU, M.A., L.T. (Second Edition). Demy 8vo, pp. 318. 1925. Rs. 5-0. Out of print. Third Edition thoroughly revised and enlarged (in the Press).

Elementary Banking, by B. RAMCHANDRA RAU, M.A., L.T. Demy 8vo, pp. 209. 1925. Rs. 3.

Economics of Leather Industry, by the same author. Demy 8vo, pp. 194. 1926. Rs. 2-8.

Inland Transport and Communication in Mediaeval India, by BIJOY KUMAR SARKAR, A.B. (Harvard), Lecturer in Economics, Calcutta University. Royal 8vo, pp. 91. 1925. Rs. 1-12.

Paper Currency in India, by B. B. DAS GUPTA, M.A., Ph.D. (Cal.), B.Sc. (Econ.) (London), Reader, Lucknow University. Demy 8vo, pp. 332. 1927. Rs. 4-0.